

Prince Metternich.¹

PART THE FIFTH.—THE DAWN OF PEACE.

THE labours of the Congress of Vienna, rudely interrupted by the sudden reappearance of Napoleon on the scene, were resumed and brought to an end after the short but stirring episode of the Hundred Days, which ended in the defeat of Waterloo, the restoration of the Bourbons, and the second Peace of Paris. Although the real hard work of the Congress had been accomplished and the chief difficulties in the way of a peaceful solution had been removed before its temporary suspension, this seems the most convenient place for a few words about the great historical meeting of those remarkable men, who some sixty or seventy years ago directed the politics of Europe in times of exceptional difficulty, fraught with momentous events, and destined to be landmarks in history. The arduous task of the statesmen, who, with Metternich at their head, had planned the concentrated movement by which Napoleon was finally crushed, began where the work of the victorious generals left off; on them devolved the work of restoration and reconstruction, when the revolutionary spirit was tamed, when the dogs of war were chained up, when the tide of conquest was rolled back, and the old towers and steeples began to appear above the subsiding waters.

Hamlet is made by the poet to curse the evil star, which presided at his birth and destined him to put a disjoined world to rights.

The time is out of joint : O cursed spite !

That ever I was born to set it right.

No such regret, it may be taken for granted, ever fell from the lips of Metternich. This was not his desponding way of looking

¹ *Memoirs of Prince Metternich*. Vols. I. and II. (1773—1815) and Vols. III. and IV. (1816—1829). Edited by Prince Richard Metternich. The Papers classified and arranged by M. A. de Klinkowström. Translated by Mrs. Alexander Napier.

at things. The times were exceptional, but he thought himself on a par with them. A time out of joint was his element, a world off its hinges his appropriate sphere of action. He was in his glory, at his proudest and highest, when, as President of the Congress of Vienna, he guided or controlled the deliberations of the brilliant group of European diplomatists whose chosen vocation it was to remodel States, parcel out territories, rectify frontiers, prop up thrones or replace dynasties, re-arrange the map of Europe, and round off the dominions of emperors and kings with supreme indifference to the interests of lesser powers, and an utter disregard of popular feelings and nationalities. Nothing in the world, he thought, could in his time take the place of the conference-table with its green cover, pens, ink, and paper; and certainly, if Metternich did not succeed in patching up permanently the worn out constitution of this old Europe of ours, it was not for want of doctoring it by congress and conference. The Congress of Vienna was succeeded in 1818 by the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle, the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle was followed by the Conference of Carlsbad in 1819 and by that of Vienna in 1820. Then one after another in close succession came the Congress of Troppau, the Congress of Laybach, and the Congress of Verona, followed in their turn by the Conferences of St. Petersburg and London, which ended in 1827 with the Triple Treaty of London.

In this interminable catalogue of diplomatic assemblages, the Congress of Vienna occupies of course the first place, and figures in their midst as the primary planet round which the others circle as secondary or satellite stars; they were intended merely to supplement the work effected and back up the decrees promulgated by the wise men of Europe at their first meeting. The work which they set themselves to do, which Metternich lived long enough to see nearly all undone, and of which scarce a vestige survives at the present hour, is too well known to need an exhaustive recapitulation. It will be enough to say, that if any one should feel disposed to write a full and accurate history of the Congress of Vienna he will find material assistance in a *Mémoire* by Friedrich Gentz, to be found amongst the miscellaneous papers left us in these volumes by Prince Metternich. The Chancellor has added some remarks of his own from which we may infer, that he guarantees its accuracy as a whole. The *Mémoire* in question opens with the following very frank avowal as to the character and objects of the

Congress, at which, it may be said in passing, the writer discharged the duties of secretary:

Those who at the time of the assembling of the Congress at Vienna had thoroughly understood the nature and objects of this Congress, could hardly have been mistaken about its course, whatever their opinion about its results might be. The grand phrases of "reconstruction of social order," "regeneration of the political system of Europe," "a lasting peace founded on a just division of strength," &c., &c., were uttered to tranquillize the people, and to give an air of dignity and grandeur to this solemn assembly; but the real purpose of the Congress was to divide amongst the conquerors the spoils taken from the vanquished. The comprehension of this truth enables us to foresee that the discussions of this Congress would be difficult, painful, and often stormy. But to understand how far they have been so, and why the hopes of so many enlightened men, but more or less ignorant of cabinet secrets, have been so cruelly disappointed, one must know the designs which the principal Powers had in presenting themselves on this great battlefield, and the development which particular circumstances and personal relations have given to these designs.

These designs the document we have been quoting from proceeds to characterize at considerable length.

The Emperor of Russia had come to the Congress in quest, first of all, of admiration, and next to direct personally the important arrangements, which were to fix the boundaries and determine the future position of the various States claiming a share in the immense amount of spoil success against the common enemy had placed at the disposal of the Allies. Three principal objects the Emperor Alexander had in coming to the Congress: (1) to take possession for ever of the whole or almost the whole of the Duchy of Warsaw; (2) to prevent Austria from profiting too much by the advantages of the new position won for her by the skill of Metternich; (3) not only to compensate Prussia by the acquisition of Saxony for her ancient Polish provinces, which he had taken from her by surprise, and which he retained, because it pleased him to do so, but also to make of her a useful and powerful ally, on whom he could rely in the future. These were the real objects he had in view; his ostensible object was to have a finger in all the affairs of Europe, and to pass for the arbiter of its destinies.

Prussia, as usual, brought to the Congress only an immoderate desire to extend her possessions at the expense of all the world, without the least regard to any principle of justice

or even of decency. This most unrighteous acquisitiveness seems to have had its origin neither in the character of the King nor in that of his Prime Minister ; for the King, although below mediocrity in point of intellect, was at bottom a good sort of man, and Hardenberg was reckoned amongst the most honourable statesmen of his day. But the political system of Prussia depended after all neither on the King nor on his Minister. Founded and pursued for a whole century, it had found fresh support in the newly awakened spirit of the nation, in the enthusiasm of the army, and in the power which a certain number of distinguished military men exercised for the time being on the Cabinet. The principal object of this party had been from the moment of Prussia's resurrection the total annexation of Saxony. Unable and unwilling to cope with Russia, they transferred their designs to Germany, and the acquisition of Saxony, however considerable in itself, was to be only the beginning of a series of political operations, by which they hoped sooner or later to efface the influence of Austria, and put Prussia at the head of the German Confederation. With what persistence and success Prussia has followed out her political programme, the German Empire of to-day is a striking proof.

England appeared at Vienna with all the prestige and vast influence which she owed to her immense successes, the prominent part she had played in the coalition, to a condition of strength and prosperity which no other Power had attained, and to the feelings of fear and respect with which from one cause or another she inspired all other Governments. By a judicious use of these advantages England, it was thought, might have given the law to all Europe ; by making common cause with Austria, she might have prevented the aggrandizement of Russia, made Prussia fall back within her own boundaries, re-established equilibrium in Germany, and secured repose to Europe for an indefinite period. England is charged with having, in the person of Lord Castlereagh, renounced this noble privilege, with having offered but a feeble resistance to the ambitious schemes of Russia, and with having ended by a total abandonment of her opposition to them. She is further accused of having in the first instance supported Prussia's designs on Saxony to their fullest extent, and then, when she returned later on to a course more favourable to Austria, of having stopped half-way, and instead of posing as the arbiter of Europe, which

she might have been, of having given her only a weak, half-hearted, and very partial support. That in the eyes of an Austrian diplomatist the conduct of England should have appeared a trifle lukewarm towards Austria and somewhat too partial to Prussia in the disputes between the two Powers, is not very surprising; the reader will therefore be prepared to find him expressing disappointment at the comparatively mediocre part which England, holding as she did the first place in this great council of the nations, is thought by him to have played in its deliberations and its actual results. But we cannot record without challenging his confident assertion, that for the unsatisfactory issue of the Congress England is mainly responsible; for this is to impute to her a lack of public spirit and an excessive regard for her own private interests wholly unwarranted by facts.

No enlightened Englishman, it may safely be assumed, will carry admiration of his country to the infatuated length of holding her up to other nations as a model of constant and uniform disinterestedness in politics. It may be true, that she has on a hundred occasions rudely elbowed her way through the selfish crowd, to pick up as much as she could get in the general scramble; she may have more than once, on the *divide et impera* principle, fostered disturbance amongst neighbouring States, and then profited by their disunion to secure her own advancement. All this and much more she may have been guilty of under other circumstances; but to charge her with selfishness or want of public spirit at the Congress of Vienna is as ungenerous as it is unreasonable. The accusation will not lie. Granted for a moment and for argument's sake, that England wanted peace, peace before everything, peace, as the Austrian memorialist avers, at any price and almost on any terms,—which of all the Powers, great or small, had earned a better title to peace than England? Which of them had shed her best blood more generously, or expended her treasure more lavishly, in waging a persistent and successful war with the common enemy for upwards of twenty long years? Which of them was it who furnished the sinews of war, fed, clothed, and paid the soldiers of every army in Europe throughout the protracted contest? Which of them alone held out untired, never cried "Hold, enough!" never came to terms with the common enemy at the expense of her friends? And was there one of her allies who had not sooner or later, for a shorter or a

longer time, compounded with the foe, done his bidding, and closed her harbours against the shipping and the commerce of England? And now that the day of reckoning is come, she is to be abused and taxed with indifference, want of energy and public spirit, because, forsooth, she was not unconditionally prepared to spill more of her blood and spend more of her treasure in a vain attempt to play policeman to the rest of Europe, see fair play and honour kept among thieves, and side with this rather than with that covetous Power, but stood aloof and left them to scream, and claw, and tear one another in their greed of spoil, like foul harpies at their obscene work of hideous plunder. Lord Castlereagh may have been wrong-headed, and the Duke of Wellington a passive rather than an active member of the Congress, but they were faithful to their instructions, and the honour of England was safe in their keeping. Indeed, of all the great Powers, England alone came forth from the Congress not richer but poorer than she went in, and it is eternally to her honour that taking her stand, as might have been anticipated, on the side of freedom, she raised her voice effectually, but to her own great cost, in favour of a general abolition of the odious Slave Trade.

The part of the French Ministers at the Congress was the simplest and most agreeable of all. Everything relating to France having been regulated by the Treaty of Paris, they had nothing to demand for themselves, and could confine their attention to watching the conduct of others. The defence of the weak against the strong restrains a Power within its proper limits, and keeps her to the task of working for the re-establishment of the political balance of power. To do her justice, the conduct of France at the Congress was in strict accordance with these principles; she made no proposal, started no scheme for the slightest extension of her frontier, and put forward no claims in the least incompatible with the rights of her neighbours or with the general tranquillity. But if M. de Talleyrand and his colleagues never worked against the general good, it is also true that special obstacles paralyzed their efforts to further it. The exaggerated fear manifested by some of the Powers of appearing to side with France in an attempt to get rid of the secret article of the Treaty of Paris, which authorized the Allies "to divide the countries conquered by France according to arrangements agreed upon among themselves"—an authorization England and Austria would have been willing enough

to forego, if they had been suffered to do so by the ambition of Russia and Prussia—was one barrier to the exercise of any very great influence on the deliberations by the French Plenipotentiaries, and explains in great measure their comparative effacement, especially at the outset of the negotiations. Again, to take up a firm and imposing attitude calculated to overawe the Russian and Prussian Cabinets, who considered their wills irresistible, France must have been prepared to go to war. This she pretended to be, but she was not so in reality; and when once the secret of her policy was suspected, her arguments ceased to encourage her friends, and her menaces to terrify her enemies. Not that if England and Austria, with whom she had entered into a secret alliance, defensive and offensive, for securing the observance of the Treaty of Paris, had preferred war to concessions or compromise, she would not have proved faithful to her engagements; quite the contrary, but she was not decided enough to influence these Powers, which from one cause or another preferred any arrangement to a fresh explosion, an evil which they feared above everything.

Austria, therefore, found herself amongst these four Powers in a most embarrassing position. On the one hand, she could not but look on the Emperor Alexander as a declared enemy, in spite of his many protestations of friendship for the Emperor Francis, and Prussia, always carried away by her own greed and ambition, was the inseparable ally of this enemy; on the other hand, she was deterred from contracting too close a friendship with France, not by any reason of direct repugnance or distrust—she was perfectly convinced of her loyal and friendly disposition—but by the fear of lowering herself in public estimation, if she leagued herself openly with a Power which till quite lately had been the common enemy of Europe, and which had not as yet recovered its good name in the minds of the multitude. But there was yet another and possibly more powerful consideration, which interfered to prevent a hearty understanding with France. Perfectly at one with the latter Power in her views as to Poland and Germany, she was not so with respect to Italy. France had a natural interest in regaining her old influence in Italy, by the re-establishment of the deposed branches of the Bourbon family at Parma, and principally at Naples, whilst Austria had as powerful motives for wishing to consolidate her own power by giving her support to Joachim Murat, whose cause she had espoused, and by preserving for

the ex-Empress Marie Louise the Duchy of Parma, solemnly guaranteed to her by a recent and formal convention. The Cabinet of Vienna had, therefore, to fear that by allying herself too closely with France, whose assistance was essentially useful in her contests with Russia and Prussia, she might have to sacrifice to her a part of her own great interests in Italy. There remained then only England to give a helping hand to Austria in her opposition to Russia and Prussia. But England, with her mind made up not to quarrel with any one, would not even grant her a subsidy; and though, if war broke out, Austria might count on receiving help from France, this help would be tardy and constrained, and would render public opinion throughout Germany still more hostile to her. Thus Austria was in the position of having to rely on herself against Russia and Prussia united; one ally she had, and one only, Bavaria, who would follow her at the first call.

This somewhat dry abstract of the position of affairs at the beginning of the negotiations will perhaps serve to throw some light on the difficult situation in which Metternich found himself placed at the Congress of Vienna. He had at last disposed of his most terrible adversary after many a tough tussle; he was now to try a fall with another, who, though incomparably less formidable, continued to give him infinite trouble. The Emperor Alexander, as usual on such occasions, was at the bottom of all the mischief at the Congress. On arriving in Vienna, he lost no time in embroiling himself with Austria, England, and France. His displeasure with the first-named Power arose from the many grievances, already referred to in previous articles, which he had, or pretended to have, against Prince Metternich. Their rupture came to a head in December, 1813. Angry and bitter discussions took place almost every day during the last part of the campaign, and by the time the Allies reached Paris they with difficulty preserved even an outward appearance of friendship. The Emperor, having little by little accustomed himself to look upon Metternich as a never-failing obstacle to his designs, as a man bent upon opposing and thwarting him, came at last to view him as a sworn enemy. The imperturbable calmness, unruffled smoothness, and dignified patience with which Metternich met his prejudices, instead of softening, served only to aggravate and embitter the Emperor, whose secret jealousy of Metternich's success both in politics and in society increased the irritation. This at last reached the point of

something very nearly akin to downright hatred, and during the Czar's stay in Vienna his daily explosions of ill-humour and anger, whilst affording an inexhaustible fund of curiosity and amusement to frivolous minds, were deplored by sensible men as something little short of a calamity. Gentz is very likely correct in his statement that in the extravagant conduct of the Czar, and in his petty pique against Metternich, will be found the key to many otherwise inexplicable events of the Congress; but it is poor comfort to be told, that if his craziness did incalculable harm to the best interests of Europe, it also inflicted an irreparable blow in public opinion on the personal reputation of the Russian Emperor himself, that it disclosed him to the world in his true character, and cooled the general admiration, which his many brilliant and amiable qualities had inspired in the breasts of his contemporaries, who when they ceased to admire him for his virtues, ceased also to fear him for his power.

But it was not Austria and Metternich alone, who were in disfavour with the Russian Autocrat; he was as much out of humour with England and her chief Plenipotentiary. His friendly relations with England—a Power he never really liked, whose friendship he cultivated either from interest or from fear—had cooled very sensibly since his visit to London. Lord Castlereagh was particularly distasteful to him; he called him cold, formal, and pedantic, and there were moments when he would have treated him as he treated Metternich, if the fear of openly compromising himself with the British Government had not forced him to dissemble. Neither was the Emperor inclined to be one whit more friendly with France and her representative. He had not forgiven the King his adoption of a system of government contrary to the advice the Czar had thought proper to give him; and he was furious with Talleyrand, who, on the entrance of the Allies into Paris, had feigned to recognize no law but the will of the Russian Emperor, but who four weeks later had contrived to wriggle himself free again. In the early stages of the Congress there were some violent scenes between the Emperor and M. de Talleyrand; subsequently, however, the latter found a way to impress Alexander by his cleverness, his repartee, and his *savoir-faire*; but the secret aversion remained the same. The Czar's brother-in-law, the King of Bavaria, and the King of Denmark were both alike odious to him, the one on account of his close relations with Austria, the other because he had the courage to speak up and upbraid the Autocrat with

his quarrelsome and mischievous conduct. The King of Prussia, therefore, was the Russian Emperor's only friend, a monarch whose personal attachment was secured by feelings of gratitude, by the weakness of his character, and by his distrust of every one else. The Cabinet of Prussia, too, anticipating much opposition to its schemes of self-aggrandizement, had from the first entered into the closest alliance with Russia.

With these elements of discord in its bosom, the wonder is, not that the Congress effected so little good, but that it did comparatively so little harm. The Emperor of Russia began the strife by at once claiming the Duchy of Warsaw as a just indemnity for his sacrifices in the late war. The demand was at first regarded by the Plenipotentiaries merely as a feeler thrown out by the Czar, and was, therefore, listened to with calm indifference. When it was seen that he was really in earnest, Prince Metternich, although fully alive to the inconvenience of carrying on negotiations by private confidential conversations, determined to try this means of bringing the Czar to listen to reason. Accordingly he had four or five private conferences with the Emperor; but he found him obstinately deaf to every argument; his anger and violence grew in intensity from one stormy interview to another, until at last the Prince declared to his friends, that nothing on earth would induce him to see the Emperor again in private. He kept his word, and for three months never set foot inside the Emperor's door, until, as already related, he was commissioned by his own Imperial master to break the news of Napoleon's escape from Elba to the Emperor of Russia and the King of Prussia. Alexander, on his side, was to the full as obdurate; he would go to no ball or *fête* given at Prince Metternich's house; he turned a deaf ear to the remonstrances addressed to him by his sisters, by the Archduke Palatine, and by all his friends; and whilst affecting to treat Madame de Metternich and her daughter with marked consideration, he always maintained that the Prince had offended him so mortally, that they could never again have any personal communication. There can be little doubt, that throughout this undignified and paltry quarrel the Emperor, carried away by passion or madness, was alone to blame, and that Metternich conducted himself with his invariable good sense, tact, and courtesy, and with all that propriety of speech and manner which were a second nature to the man.

M. de Metternich put *hors de combat*, Lord Castlereagh entered the lists; but with no better success. The former had tried the expedient of private interviews, the latter adopted that of a private correspondence. In these private notes, of much vigour, but little tact, in which he spoke sometimes in his own name, but oftener in that of his Government, he endeavoured to show the Emperor the injustice of his pretensions, and the danger with which his projects threatened Europe. To each of these documents the Czar replied, sometimes with shallow or evasive reasoning, sometimes with haughty disdain, always with extreme bitterness; and their correspondence, so far from proving useful, was positively hurtful to the success of the negotiations. Arguments were wasted in it which should have been reserved for a formal negotiation, and in undertaking a private correspondence Lord Castlereagh committed a mistake all the more inexcusable, that the Emperor made no secret of his opposition to the ordinary, more public, and formal mode of conducting the deliberations of the Congress.

England and Austria, having both failed to move the Emperor of Russia from his purpose, addressed themselves in the next place to Prussia, who had affected for some weeks past to associate herself with them in their attitude towards Russia. But her friendliness had been only apparent; it was mere grimace. Instead of lending them her support against the pretensions of Russia, she all at once veered round and declared, that having reflected on all the consequences of the plan proposed by Austria and England, sounded the intentions of the Emperor Alexander, and seen the impossibility of effecting any change in his projects, she had no better counsel to give her friends than that of yielding to Russia with a good grace. Then followed a rupture between Austria and Prussia. Mutual animosity took the place of the intimate relations which had united these two Powers since 1813, but which events in the late war had already greatly shaken and impaired. The fate of Poland was from this moment sealed, and that unhappy country was handed over to the tender mercies of the Sovereign who, having never ceased to flatter the Poles with hopes of freedom, was the first, after he had gained his own ends, to inform them of the "impossibility of re-establishing in Europe that ancient political system of which the independence of Poland formed a part." The fact is, Austria now found herself placed unpleasantly between two alternatives, and in her eyes

the question of the annexation of Poland by Russia was thrown into the shade by the greater importance of the proposed acquisition of Saxony by her rival for supremacy in Germany. As the quarrel between herself and Prussia grew in bitterness from day to day, Austria found it expedient to sidle up to Russia. Abandoned by Prussia in her attempts to thwart Russia, she now hoped to make use of the latter to moderate the demands of the former. Russia responded to these advances, but exacted as a *sine quâ non* of her support the settlement of the affairs of Poland in the sense of her previous demands. Persuaded that she could not save both Saxony and Poland, Austria decided to let the latter go; and it went. This is how it came to pass that the Empire of Russia gained one of the most fertile countries of Europe and three millions and a half of new subjects, after deducting close upon a million handed over to Prussia, and another half million delivered to Austria, for their respective shares in this iniquitous plunder.

It was now Prussia's turn to put in her claim for a big slice of the cake, and to give a proportionate amount of trouble. Abetted and encouraged in her designs by the Czar, she too, like Russia, arrived at the Congress with the fixed determination of taking possession of the whole of Saxony, as an equivalent for her ancient provinces imprudently, perhaps craftily, ceded to Russia by the Treaty of Kalisch. Unfortunately for her chances of a successful opposition to the schemes of the Prussian Cabinet, Austria had in her extreme anxiety to win Prussia over to her side and checkmate Russia on the side of Poland, unwittingly played into the hands of Prussia. To gain her support against the pretensions of the Czar, she had gone so far as to promise her, as the condition of her assistance, that if no other means could be devised to satisfy the just claims of Prussia, the Emperor Francis would even consent to the incorporation of Saxony with the Prussian monarchy. This step, which caused more grief to Metternich in three months than he had experienced in all his life, was accompanied by the verbal consent of Austria and England to the provisional occupation of Saxony by Prussia. The consequences of this last fatal concession were obvious. The occupation of Saxony once granted to a Power so clingingly tenacious as Prussia, there could be no hope of dislodging her from it by simple representations. The angry feelings aroused in England by the designs of Prussia, together with the for-

midable attacks on the Government in Parliament occasioned by the countenance lent by the English Ambassador to those designs, warned Lord Castlereagh that he had gone too far, and his own anger with the Prussian Ministers for the equivocal part they had played in the affair of Poland, scarcely needed the help of instructions from home to determine him to change his attitude, and abandon the idea of consenting to the complete incorporation of Saxony with Prussia.

It was under these circumstances that Metternich, supported by Lord Castlereagh and Prince Talleyrand, addressed his memorandum to the Prussian cabinet, by which, in terms extremely moderate and conciliatory, whilst refusing to sanction the absorption of the whole of Saxony by Prussia, he offered the latter Power, besides all that she had gained in Westphalia and on the Rhine, a portion of the territory of Saxony, which included a population of about half a million of souls. To the surprise of every one, this diplomatic note, which, if it erred at all, erred on the side of compliance, instead of allaying, served only to embitter the irritation of Prussia. The proposed compromise was denounced as a flagrant proof of the perfidy of Austria by Prussia, who, having become familiarized with the idea of annexing the whole of Saxony, chose to view the proposal for the re-establishment of the deposed King in his dominions as an act of treason to herself. The Emperor of Russia of course joined lustily in the chorus with the partisans of Prussia. The friends of Austria, on the other hand, England, France, and Bavaria, took fire at the outrageous pretensions of Prussia. The storm which followed was of such violence, that for a fortnight those who were behind the scenes looked upon war as inevitable. Preparations were made and troops assembled in all directions; nothing was spoken of but the speedy dissolution of the Congress. The Emperor Alexander denounced Metternich to his Sovereign and to all classes in Vienna as the disturber of the public peace in Europe. As for Prussia, she did not even deign to give a formal answer to the note addressed to her by Austria, but treated the proposals which it contained as beneath her notice. It was several days before the storm abated, but the injustice and extravagance of Prussia yielded at last to the calm and intrepid bearing of Metternich, the firmness of Talleyrand, and the peaceful exhortations of Castlereagh. The Emperor of Russia, in particular, was brought to listen to reason by his fear that England, irritated by the obstinacy of

Prussia, might at last openly take action against both her and Russia. The rumour of a secret agreement came to by Austria, France, England, Bavaria, and Hanover got wind, and the report, which as we know was not without foundation, caused his Majesty the Emperor of All the Russias to lower his tone prodigiously in a very short time.

Then followed fresh projects and counter-projects, and fresh objections were raised and fresh demands made by Prussia, who insisted amongst other things upon the cession to her of the town of Leipsic, a demand which the other powers were as firmly resolved not to concede. This new source of dissension would not in all probability have been either easily or speedily settled, if an unforeseen circumstance had not suddenly occurred to terminate the difference. This was the recall of Lord Castlereagh to London. Loath to lose the results of his hard work, and unwilling to leave Vienna without having removed the difficulty about Saxony, he made one last supreme effort to accomplish his purpose. He displayed astonishing energy, activity, and perseverance; he worked day and night, now with the King of Prussia and the Emperor of Russia, now with Prince Metternich and Prince Hardenberg, until in the end he succeeded in coming to a definite understanding with the latter Minister. According to this arrangement Saxony was divided into two nearly equal parts, of which that remaining to the King of Saxony was the most populous, that which fell to the lot of Prussia the largest in area. The King of Saxony, who was treated throughout as a dethroned prince and a prisoner, and his kingdom as a conquered country, retained about one million two hundred thousand subjects, with Dresden, Leipsic, and Bautzen, and all the frontier along the kingdom of Bohemia. To console Prussia for the loss of Leipsic, which she had fought for with so much ardour, the Emperor of Russia made over to her Thorn and its environs, which in consequence lost its chance of becoming, like Cracow, a free city.

One of the most important matters which came under the consideration of the Congress of Vienna, though not perhaps so difficult of adjustment as the affairs either of Germany or of Italy, was the reconstruction of the German Confederacy. The old Empire and the younger Confederation of the Rhine having been both swept away by the changes of time, it became necessary to create some new bond of union between the greater and the lesser States of Germany. The mutual

jealousies of Austria and Prussia rendered this no easy task ; but the judgment and tact of Metternich proved equal to the occasion. In spite of his inherent conservatism and infatuated clinging to the old landmarks, the Austrian Minister was too long-headed not to perceive that the shadowy possession of the ancient crown of the Carlovingians, whilst bringing his imperial master no real influence in Germany, would involve him in endless difficulties with the growing power of Prussia, whose jealousy would be aroused by an Empire placed in such close proximity to her own dominions, which already included a third of the whole population of Germany. Metternich, therefore, renounced for his Sovereign the faded and tattered purple of the Cæsars, in exchange for the more real authority conferred by the Presidency of the Diet. His reflections had led him to the conclusion, that whilst reserving to herself the supreme direction of affairs in Germany, Austria should endeavour to extend her power to the south.

Under the influence of this new idea, Metternich came to the Congress ready armed with a scheme, which resulted in what is known as the Bund, and which, now a thing of the past, once united Germany loosely together for purposes of domestic legislation, and especially for mutual support against attack from without. This new Confederation was governed by a Diet, under the presidency of Austria, in which, together with the power of making separate war and peace, Austria and Prussia possessed four out of seven votes, a preponderance which gave to these States, so far as external relations were concerned, the entire government of the Confederacy. But so powerful was the sense still entertained by the greater Powers of the necessity of a powerful barrier against future aggressions on the part of France, that Talleyrand found himself unable to stir up any resistance to the plan, and it was, therefore, agreed to without opposition. The adoption by Metternich of this new political system, by which he hoped to open out for the exertions of his country a new field in the south, will explain his touchiness at the Congress on the subject of Sardinia, and Naples, his determination to secure Venice and Lombardy to Austria, for her share of the booty, and his anxiety to develop her power, for military and commercial purposes, by fresh acquisitions on the shores of the Adriatic.

On the whole, whatever we may think of its unsatisfactory issue as to general results, Metternich, as an Austrian, can have

had little reason to complain of the Congress of Vienna, since it gave his country not only all she had lost since the commencement of the Revolutionary war, but much, Venice for example, to which she had not the shadow of a right. Its general results may be thus briefly summarized. Besides its gifts to Austria, it gave a large slice of Saxony to Prussia; it virtually confirmed the partition of Poland; it wedded Belgium to Holland; it formed Germany into a Confederation, in which Austrian influence was to preponderate, as if for the express purpose of preventing German unity, a consummation it may be thought by some to have hastened rather than retarded. In short, it was a settlement which, as Gentz has confessed to us, aimed at nothing but satisfying the territorial greed of the principal parties to it; without thought of natural congruity or cohesion, of nationality or self-government, and with no more regard for the feelings and wishes of the populations of the transferred districts than is felt by men, when they shift their horses, sheep, and cows from one estate to another. The only one of all the Powers who showed any signs of disinterestedness at the Congress—and even she is accused by M. Thiers of pressing the union of Belgium and Holland to provide an inlet for her manufactures, and prevent the renewal of the Continental blockade—was England, who, after surrendering the greater part of her conquests, made the abolition of the slave traffic her standing-point.

But this so-called settlement had no one element of stability; it crumbled away piecemeal, and long before Metternich's death there was little of it left but the framework of a treaty without vitality or force. He, nevertheless, points to it as a masterpiece of diplomacy, a monument of political foresight, whose consummate wisdom and excellence are proved by its durability.

There was no doubt [he says], that if the Congress confined itself to the limits of calm calculation, it would be exposed to great opposition. The longest time of political peace which Europe had ever enjoyed would, however, suffice to tranquilize the conscience of the great monarch and his assistant, even if the work of the Congress itself had not remained triumphantly fireproof in the years 1848 and 1849!

If the Congress is to be looked upon as having succeeded in putting together anything better than a disjointed fabric utterly unsafe to touch, the consciences of the enlightened monarch

(Francis) and his assistant (Metternich) must have been as easily tranquillized on this head, as they were on that of the manifold acts of spoliation by which they had obtained for Austria an increase of three thousand two hundred square miles of territory. Was the work of the Congress triumphantly fireproof in the years 1848 and 1849? Was it fireproof in 1848, when the flames drove the Emperor of Austria from his capital, and when Metternich fled into England? Or, in 1849, when the hopes of the Empire in Italy rested on old Radetzky, and when but for Russian fire-engines the House of Hapsburg would have lost the brightest jewel in its crown? As well might it be said, that the work remained triumphantly fireproof in 1846, when Austria found herself compelled to extinguish the flames of an insurrection in Galicia; or in 1831, when she put down the Poles, and annexed the free city of Cracow; or, in 1830, when that great work of the Congress, the Kingdom of the Low Countries, broke in two; or when, in the same year, thirty thousand Austrian troops were despatched as extinguishers into Lombardy; or when, lastly, she once again sent for her engines, and turned on the water, and plied her hose to put out a revolutionary fire in Parma and Modena in 1827, and another in Naples and Piedmont in 1822? Well, fireproof or not in 1848 and 1849, the work of the Congress has not survived to our own times. Metternich himself lived long enough to see the nephew of his old antagonist firmly seated on the throne of France, with a special mission, as he thought, to cancel the stipulations of the Treaty of Paris and undo the work of the Congress of Vienna; and he died just as the death-blow was being dealt to the supremacy of his country in Italy. Since then, Austria has been forced to let go her hold first of Lombardy, and next of Venice; the smaller kingdoms and petty principalities of the Peninsula, Naples and Tuscany, Parma and Modena, about which so much fuss was made at the Congress, and after it, have been swallowed up in the new Kingdom of Italy; Austria's preponderance in the affairs of Germany has yielded to Prussian ascendancy, and Metternich's pet creation, the Bund or Confederation, has made way for the lately constituted Empire of Germany, under the hegemony of her inveterate and more successful rival.

To pass from graver to lighter matters, this very imperfect sketch of the Congress of Vienna would be still more incomplete

without at least a brief passing allusion to the feasting, fiddling, and dancing, by means of which the assembled Sovereigns and diplomatists contrived to relieve the monotony of their labours; all the more, perhaps, that the Editor of the Memoirs has judged it necessary to adopt an apologetic tone with reference to the celebrated *mot* of the Prince de Ligne, *Le Congrès danse mais ne marche pas*. He points in defence of all this junketting to the number of crowned heads with their retinues, and other illustrious visitors, gathered together within the walls of Vienna, for whom the Imperial Court was bound to provide recreation, adding that the festivities had no connection with the labours of the Congress, to which they were no serious hindrance, as is proved by the short duration of the Congress, which accomplished its work in five months. Some entries in Gentz's Diary, who knew everything that was passing, both before and behind the scenes, tell a different story. Hardly a day passed without dinners, balls, and festivities, at which all these great personages, supposed to be absorbed in the destinies of nations, made a point of being present.

If the Secretary of the Congress is to be believed, M. de Metternich himself gave scarcely less time to pleasure than to business, found as much occupation for his heart as for his head, discoursed more willingly and more volubly on his *affaires du cœur* than on matters of State, and displayed to the eyes of his friends greater anxiety concerning a miserable quarrel with this or that worthless duchess (Gentz gives their names), than about an impending rupture with Russia or Prussia. This is the concluding and somewhat cynical reflection of Gentz, who, if we may judge from the tone of his Diary, was not likely to be troubled with excessive squeamishness, on the closing scenes of the year 1814, by no means complimentary to the distinguished personages who took part in them :

The aspect of public affairs is melancholy ; not as at other times by reason of the imposing and crushing weight suspended over our heads, but by reason of the mediocrity and inaptitude of almost all the actors ; and as I have nothing to reproach myself with, my intimate acquaintance with the pitiable course of events, and with all these paltry creatures who govern the world, far from afflicting me, is a source of amusement, and I enjoy the spectacle as if it was given expressly for my entertainment.

There is just one other subject so closely connected as to be almost identified with the name of Metternich, which requires

a word of mention before concluding this sketch of his career and character,—we mean, of course, the Holy Alliance. If the Holy Alliance was in fact what popular estimation has always held to have been, it would require a process of thorough disinfection before it could cease to be anything but an object most offensive to the nostrils of all right-minded men. Theoretically and ostensibly, the Holy Alliance was a pact entered into by the Emperors of Russia and Austria and the King of Prussia, by the terms of which these monarchs engaged to remain united together in the bonds of true brotherly love, to govern their peoples like fathers of family, to give one another mutual help in difficulty from within and danger from without, and to uphold peace, justice, and religion in their dominions. This agreement, so beautiful in theory, became in fact, if the generally accepted view of it is the correct one, an utter abomination, accountable for the maintenance of absolutism and the suppression of freedom in almost every country of Continental Europe. That is the popular idea; this is Metternich's version of the matter.

In the summer of 1815, the Emperor Alexander requested Metternich to come to him, and after explaining, that he had a great matter on hand on which monarchs only could decide, intimated a wish to speak to the Emperor Francis. After the lapse of some days Metternich learnt from the latter, that he had seen Alexander, and received from him a paper, which had given rise to grave reflection. A cursory perusal sufficed to show Metternich that it was nothing more than a philanthropic aspiration clothed in a religious garb, supplying no materials for a treaty. The Emperor of Austria and the King of Prussia took nearly the same view of it, but eventually agreed to sign it, with certain alterations and omissions suggested by Metternich, who foresaw and predicted the mischievous interpretation which must inevitably be put upon so extraordinary a document.

This [he concludes] is the history of the "Holy Alliance," which even in the partial feeling of its originator had no other object than that of a moral demonstration, whilst in the eyes of the other persons concerned the document had no meaning, and does not, therefore, deserve the interpretation which was afterwards put on it by party spirit.

The most unanswerable proof of the correctness of this statement exists in the circumstance that never afterwards did it happen that the "Holy Alliance" was made mention of between the Cabinets, nor indeed could it have been mentioned. Only the parties hostile to the

monarchs used it as a weapon to slander the purest intentions of their opponents.

The "Holy Alliance" was not an institution to keep down the rights of the people, to promote absolutism, or any other form of tyranny. It was only the overflow of the pietistic feeling of the Emperor Alexander, and the application of Christian principles to politics.

From a union of religious and political—liberal ideas the "Holy Alliance" was developed under the influence of Frau Von Krüdener and Monsieur Bergasse. No one is so well acquainted as I am with the circumstances of this "loud-sounding nothing."

This is to attempt the disinfecting process with a vengeance, and assuming these statements to be true, they suggest the consoling reflection that fools take their turn with knaves, fools perhaps predominating, in the government of the world. But is it really true, that the Holy Alliance had no existence save in the imagination of the enemies of order? It is surely throwing dust in our eyes to tell us, that its name never was and never could be afterwards mentioned by the Sovereigns who originated the abominable thing, if their invention flourished notwithstanding in full force? Is it true that Austria, in particular, under the guidance of Metternich, never trampled on freedom or upheld tyranny? Or, was it only her way of "applying Christian principles to politics," when she put a gag on the home and foreign press, used her powerful influence undeviatingly to stifle the popular voice in all matters of government, and, on the showing of Metternich's successor, Baron Pillsdorff, either turned an obstinately deaf ear to all demands for reform, however just, reasonable, and legitimate, or else procrastinated the granting of them till it was too late, and she had brought down upon her head the storm of revolution, which timely and judicious concessions might have averted? Is it indeed true, that Metternich never encouraged tyranny in any shape, never stirred a finger to prop up an effete, tottering, and doting despotism? Or, was it merely "an overflow of his pietistic feeling"—similar to that of the Emperor Nicholas, when he let loose some hundred and thirty thousand of his soldiery to smother the aspirations of Hungary for self-government—which brought Metternich forward as the opponent of South American independence, and the determined enemy of the Greeks in their longings to throw off the foul yoke of the brutal Turk; which led him, in his infatuated love of the *status quo* and indiscriminate hatred of all change, to extend his high patronage

to misrule; and then, when human nature was goaded to rebellion by the grinding tyranny of rulers, or excited to it by the mischievous malice of anarchists—thanks in great measure to the convenient pretext which his countenance of oppression afforded revolutionists to foment disturbance for their own purposes—to step in and control the wretched populations by moral or physical pressure, literally from Poland to Peru?

If the sense of humour were not as completely foreign to Metternich's solemn character, as it is to that of a Scotchman, his account of the Holy Alliance might pass for a clumsy attempt at playfulness of a grim kind. But unless the history of his times has been hitherto read upside down, either the man "who loved truth and detested falsehood" was doting when he penned these statements, or they are a justification of Talleyrand's sarcasm: *M. de Metternich ment toujours mais ne trompe jamais*. Blinded by his overflowing egotism, he seldom misses an opportunity of self-laudation or of self-defence; few, however, if any but the most superficial readers of the Memoirs, will be deceived by his numerous disclaimers of a leaning to absolutism.

"I am very often misunderstood," he remarked to a friend in 1835, "I am thought to be a great absolutist. But I am not. It is true, I do not like democracy." Then what was he—he who told another friend, that he never was and never could be one of the *juste milieu*? What was he at Carlsbad, at the Congress of Laybach, or the Congress of Verona? "Democracy," he continued, "is always and everywhere a dissolving, decomposing principle; it tends to separate men; it loosens society. This does not suit my character; I am by character and habit constructive." What on earth did he ever construct? "Reconstruction," we submit, would have been a better word; for his only notion of construction was to rebuild upon old lines and foundations with the least possible approach to novelty. Democracy did not suit his character. Well and good; but if he had not been an absolutist, he would have remembered that rulers are made for the people, not the people for their rulers, and he would have adapted himself to the altered circumstances of his times. This was precisely the very last thing of which Metternich was capable. He was not one of those, who are open to conviction, who can see the error of their ways and concede reform to avoid revolution; he was on the contrary of the number of those men, who can never read

the signs of the times until they are inscribed in letters of fire upon the wall.

If, however, it is true that M. de Metternich scouted the idea, hated the very name of reform, and, for reasons to his own mind no doubt perfectly satisfactory and convincing, would make no political concessions to his own countrymen at home, it is refreshing to be able to cite at least one instance in which he rejoices over those made by a Government other than his own. We find him, for example, congratulating the Duke of Wellington on the passing of the Catholic Emancipation Bill; though even here his tone is that of a man elated more by the triumph of a Tory Ministry over a Liberal Opposition, than by the justice thus tardily done to the aggrieved Catholics of England and Ireland. We will hope and believe that his reserve is nothing more than a little diplomatic economy, in keeping with his habitual tact, which prevented him from wounding the susceptibilities of a Protestant Government by a too free expression of his real sentiments.

Metternich to Wellington, Vienna, April 18, 1829.

Prince Esterhazy received yesterday, on the part of the Emperor, a command to express to his Britannic Majesty and his Prime Minister the very great satisfaction the signal triumph that you have just obtained has caused his Imperial Majesty. The enemies of England, of her internal peace and of her power, or the opponents of her present Administration, would alone refuse to join in this sentiment. As we are not of this number, we rejoice from the bottom of our heart at this great success. Respect and friendship compel me, my dear Duke, to address these lines to you. Believe always in the profound respect which I shall ever entertain for you, &c., &c.

The above was forwarded as an inclosure in the following letter to Prince Esterhazy, Austrian Ambassador to the Court of London :

We were informed, two days ago, of the brilliant success which the Government has gained in the Catholic affair. No news could have been received here with more sincere satisfaction. We see in this event not only the triumph of a cause, but also the consolidation of an administration on which rests—I do not hesitate to say it—our best hope for the general safety.

The Emperor desires that your Highness should express on his behalf to his Britannic Majesty his sincere congratulations on the issue of an affair which will add a fresh flower to the glory of his reign. He

wishes you also to express the same sentiments to the Duke of Wellington.

By a singular accident the triumph of the British Government coincides with a defeat of the French Ministry. The attitude of the two Governments are very accurately indicated by a comparison of the two positions.

But Metternich is by no means alone in his readiness to applaud political concessions he was unwilling or unable to grant to his own countrymen and the peoples subject to his rule. We need not travel beyond the shores of our own country for a striking example in point. In our lofty contempt for the treatment by which physicians in other countries seek to cure the diseases of the body politic, we are ever ready to step in and prescribe, with an overweening confidence commensurate in many instances with our profound ignorance of the character and wants of other nations, drugs and nostrums we will not always swallow ourselves, and in particular, to order off-hand that marvellous specific, the British Constitution, which has hitherto suited our own complaints, but which, like Bob Sawyer's calomel, is pretty certain to disagree with many, and may possibly kill some of our patients. The retort upon our presumption is obvious. Even Austria, much-erring and much-abused, might with perfect justice and propriety turn round and whisper in our ear a word of advice relative to the conduct of those who live in glass houses, and a suggestion that her self-constituted physicians should begin with the cure of their own disorders. Austria has long ago conceded to Hungary, apparently without detriment to the integrity of the Empire, an amount of self-government no English statesman has as yet been either willing or able to propose in Parliament for Ireland. We ought certainly to look at home before we preach to others; because, if on the one hand, Prince Metternich was much addicted in his time to a policy of high-handed repression in Austria, the present Prime Minister of England, on the other, the head of the most Liberal Government ever seen in this country, has found himself reluctantly obliged to pass and to exercise in our own day stringent measures of coercion in Ireland; with this great difference, however, to tell in favour of the English statesman, that, whilst the Austrian Chancellor loudly and persistently proclaimed his determination never to concede reforms in the presence of popular agitation, Mr. Gladstone, on the contrary, in a spirit of self-sacrifice and devoted-

ness beyond all praise, has for months past been employing his best energies to pass a measure, which men of all parties in the State are agreed in heartily hoping will allay the discontent by satisfying the wants of both landowners and tenants in Ireland.

But it is time to take leave of M. de Metternich ; for the Memoirs, or autobiographical portion, occupying only two hundred and sixty-five pages of the first volume of the work before us, concludes with the Congress of Vienna, and without some consecutive narrative of the kind, it is difficult to connect together the mass of disjointed documents contained in the remaining three volumes, which consist of writings of a very miscellaneous description, mostly correspondence and despatches, and of which we have availed ourselves freely in these articles. But, as already observed, Metternich has himself indicated the period from 1810 to 1815 as the most important in his life, and it may be doubted whether the promised continuation, whatever its historical value, will add to his reputation for political foresight or sagacity. It will be sufficient to say, that he was appointed Chancellor of State in 1821 ; President of the Ministerial Conferences for Home Affairs in 1827 ; and that the death of the Emperor Francis, and the accession of Ferdinand in 1835 made no apparent change in his position, which lasted thirty-nine years, and might have lasted many more had he not been overthrown by a revolution from without.

No impartial tribunal will deny to Metternich the credit of having been remarkable amongst statesmen for cultivation and accomplishment. He was conversant with several branches of science ; he was no mean proficient in music ; he drew and designed well ; as Curator of the Academy in Vienna he was a zealous and intelligent patron of the fine arts ; and although, as we have heard from his own lips, he himself thought meanly of his literary powers, he wrote with the ease and correctness of an author by profession. His "Gallery of Celebrated Contemporaries," comprising "Napoleon Bonaparte, A Portrait," with incidental sketches of his Court and family, and "Alexander the First, Emperor of Russia, A Portrait," are all marked by great literary skill, clearness of judgment, and sound discrimination of character.

In making up the final account of his merits and demerits, allowance must be made for the circumstances in which Metternich was placed, and we should bear in mind the incoherent and heterogeneous composition of the Empire, over whose

destinies he was called to preside, and the efforts and address required to maintain amidst new creations, in all its ancient splendour and power, this survival, as it has been called, of a by-gone time. But when, in assigning him the place which his name is to occupy in history, full weight has been given to considerations such as these; when, in appreciating the real nature of his services to Austria and the world, it is admitted that their destinies might have been very different, if Metternich had not appeared upon the stage during the Napoleonic wars, that he restored his country, wasted by successive invasions, to a state of confidence and prosperity; when, in a word, all has been said that even Metternich himself could urge, to enforce his merits and extenuate his faults, it will be found that his claims to a high place in the estimation of mankind can scarcely be made to rest on the loftiness of his aims, or the soundness of his principles, or the comprehensiveness of his views. His distinctive qualities are not those of the great administrator. His whole administration shows a chain of events coming to pass against his wishes, and in spite of his efforts to control them. *Laissez venir* was his ruling principle in life, and though with masterly skill he not unfrequently got possession of the current and turned it his own way, it is as undeniably true, that he constantly sacrificed and abandoned quite as much as he ever defended and saved. His is not the glory of having left the great Empire he governed so long either much better or wiser than he found it; his credit consists in this, that where he could not do positive good nor wholly prevent evil, he worked powerfully, and with some success, to avert what he believed to be political disaster.

But if not a great statesman in the highest sense of the word, Metternich was a great man in the lower sphere of diplomacy. Nor should it be thought depreciatory of his pre-eminence in this department, to assert that, unlike Prince Bismarck or Count Cavour or M. Thiers, he owed his influence and success even here less to intellectual superiority than to external advantages inborn or acquired—to look, air, tone of voice, to a handsome presence and noble bearing, to charm and grace of manner, to art in conciliating opinion, and adroitness in attracting sympathy. There are times when the efficiency of an instrument depends more upon its smoothness than its strength. We all know how the curved and narrow blade of Saladin's highly-tempered scimitar cut clean asunder the yielding cushion

of silk and down, before which the strength of the ponderous two-handed sword, wielded by the brawny arms of Cœur-de-Lion, would have fallen powerless. We have in Prince Metternich the example of a man who, by the perfect possession and opportune exercise of great self-command and consummate tact, was more than once enabled to play a distinguished part and effect great things during a very long and very eventful career.

WILLIAM LOUGHNAN.

Fables about Papal Infallibility.

IT would have been better, before advancing what he calls disproofs of Infallibility,¹ if Dr. Littledale had taken from some authorized source an explanation of what Catholics understand by that word. Infallibility is not a term to be interpreted anyhow at the whim of every reader; it is a technical expression with a precise and definite meaning given by the Council of the Vatican. We may add, as a matter of fact, that the title "Infallibility" was studiously avoided, according to Fessler, the Secretary of the Council, as the heading of the chapter which contains the definition, and in its stead was substituted, "On the Infallible Teaching Office of the Roman Pontiff." The phrase "On the Infallible Teaching Office of the Roman Pontiff" was chosen purposely instead of the title "On Infallibility" in order to anticipate the erroneous deductions which might arise from the general term Infallibility on the part of those who were disposed to dispute this doctrine on the ground of being so general.² The Council says that the Pope possesses the same Infallibility as the Church on points of faith and morals when he speaks *ex cathedrâ*, that is, in the words of the Council, "when he (the Pope), in the exercise of his office of Pastor and Doctor of all Christians, by virtue of his highest Apostolical power, defines a doctrine on faith and morals to be held by the whole Church. According to the Vatican Council, then, the Pope is infallible when, and only when, he speaks *ex cathedrâ*, and he speaks *ex cathedrâ* when, and only when, he defines a doctrine on faith and morals to be held by the whole Church. Accordingly, theologians teach with Ballerini,³ that the Infallibility of the Pope does not extend to personal and private opinions, or to simple precepts not touching a definition of faith, or to rescripts and such like, but is limited by the Vatican

¹ *Plain Reasons against joining the Church of Rome*, p. 160.

² Fessler, *True and False Infallibility*, p. 38.

³ *De vi et ratione Primatus*, cap. xiv. § vi. Veronæ, 1766.

Council to teaching the whole Church definitively some truth relating to faith or morals. We proceed to examine in the light of this explanation Dr. Littledale's Disproofs of Papal Infallibility.

The following are given by Dr. Littledale: (a) Pope Liberius subscribed an Arian Creed, and anathematized St. Athanasius as a heretic. As to the first point, Pope Liberius is said, let us suppose rightly for the sake of Dr. Littledale, to have subscribed a formula of the Synod of Sirmium, in which the omission of consubstantial seemed to favour the Arians. Three decrees were drawn up—in two there was heretical doctrine, in the one against Photinus, signed by Liberius,⁴ there was no doctrinal error, but the omission of the word consubstantial might have been abused by the heretics. Freely granting this to Dr. Littledale, and further allowing that Liberius may have sinned through carelessness in a matter of grave importance, we ask, What is there in all this to show that Liberius erred speaking *ex cathedrâ*? The Pope may do a stupid or an imprudent act productive of damage to souls; he may even, in his private capacity, subscribe an heretical creed: to prove error in an *ex cathedrâ* pronouncement, you must show that he defined that such heretical creed was to be held by the Universal Church. This Dr. Littledale does not even attempt to show. Indeed, we doubt if Dr. Littledale understands what Catholics mean by Papal Infallibility. It is further alleged by Dr. Littledale, that Liberius condemned St. Athanasius as a heretic. Even supposing he did, theologians allow that the Popes can make mistakes by condemning the innocent or acquitting the guilty, and be a monster of iniquity in addition, and still remain infallible in the only sense in which the Council of the Vatican declares him to possess this privilege. In judgments about persons, the Roman Pontiff can go wrong: for informers may mislead him, false documents may be introduced, and the like, without detriment to his Infallibility. If in the case before us, Liberius had, in condemning Athanasius, defined that the Son of God was not consubstantial with the Father, then Dr. Littledale might shout for joy. But no such statement is found in the letter attributed to Liberius. Athanasius had many enemies, and the Pontiff—according to some, while others strongly deny—seems, to have lent credence to their charges against the faith and morals of the Saint. Even though the condemnation was made the occasion for many to embrace Arianism, this would only

⁴ Ballerini, *De vi et ratione Primatus*, cap. xv. § viii. n. 50.

show that Liberius was at fault without raising any difficulties on the score of Infallibility.⁵

Pope Honorius is next cited by Dr. Littledale. (b) Pope Honorius, says Dr. Littledale, was unanimously condemned by the Sixth General Council as a heretic, for having publicly sided with the monothelite heresy and officially taught it in Pontifical Letters. The case about Honorius is this. Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople, favoured, or, rather, did not condemn, a doctrine about our Lord's Person which afterwards the Sixth Council pronounced heretical. He consulted Pope Honorius, who in two letters declared his agreement with Sergius. Forty years after his death Honorius was declared a heretic because of these letters. The words of the Council are: "To Cyrus a heretic, anathema—to Honorius the heretic, anathema, &c., &c."⁶ The simple question to be decided is—Did these heretical letters proceed from him as an infallible authority, or as a private bishop? If in the latter capacity, these letters to Sergius prove nothing against the dogma of Papal Infallibility; if in the former, we admit Dr. Littledale has gained his point. It is perfectly clear that Honorius wrote these letters as simple private instructions, without any intention to define. "What resemblance do these letters of Honorius," asks Cardinal Newman,⁷ "bear to the 'Pius Episcopus, Servus Servorum Dei, Sacro approbante Concilio, ad perpetuam rei memoriam,' with the 'Si quis huic nostræ definitioni contradicere (quod Deus avertat) præsumperit, anathema sit' of the *Pastor Æternus*? What to the 'Venerabilibus fratribus, Patriarchis, Primatibus, Archiepiscopis, et Episcopis universis,' &c., and with the date and signature, 'Datum Romæ apud Sanctum Petrum, die 8 Dec. anno 1864, &c., Pius PP. IX.' of the *Quanta Cura*? The condemnation of Honorius by the Council in no sense compromises the doctrine of Papal Infallibility. At the utmost it only decides that Honorius, in his own person, was a heretic, which is inconsistent with no Catholic doctrine; but we may rather hope and believe that the anathema fell not upon him, but upon his letters in their objective sense, he not intending personally what his letters legitimately expressed."

This reply of Cardinal Newman is amply sufficient to prove,

⁵ See Bouix, *De Papa*, vol. ii. p. 282, for text of the formula of faith in the Synod of Sirmium; Mansi, *Collection of Councils*, t. iii. col. 257, &c. Florentiæ, 1759.

⁶ Bouix, *De Papa*, vol. ii. p. 312.

⁷ *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk*, p. 108.

against Dr. Littledale, that Honorius, however he may have gone astray, did not teach false doctrine in an *ex cathedra* definition. And this is all we are now concerned to maintain against Dr. Littledale. But it is right also to mention that though the matter is in our judgment involved in some obscurity, writers of distinction in our own days, as Bottalla, Perrone, Bouix, Palmieri, deny there was any doctrinal error in Honorius' letters, and attribute his condemnation to the negligence he displayed in not suppressing clearly and resolutely with his supreme authority the monothelite heresy. This view is strengthened by the letter of Pope Leo the Second to the Emperor Constantine, in which the Council was confirmed. The Pope thus speaks: "We anathematize the inventors of new error, Theodorus of Pharanita, Cyrus, &c., and Honorius, who has not enlightened this Apostolical Church by the doctrine of Apostolical tradition, but has allowed it, though stainless, to be soiled by profane treachery"—*Anathematizamus novi erroris inventores Theodorum Pharanitanum, Cyrum, &c., nec non et Honorium, qui hanc Apostolicam Ecclesiam non Apostolicæ traditionis doctrina lustravit, sed profana prodicione immaculatam maculari permisit*. The stain put upon the Roman See is the profane treachery of Honorius, which is thus described by the same Leo in a letter to the Spanish Bishops: "Who had been enemies of the purity of the Apostolic teaching, and at their death had been punished by eternal damnation, that is, Theodorus, Cyrus, &c., with Honorius, who did not quench at the start the flame of heretical teaching as became the Apostolical authority, but by his negligence fostered it"—*Qui adversus Apostolicæ doctrinæ puritatem perduelles exstiterant, abeuntes quidem æterna damnatione mulctati sunt, id est, Theodorus, Cyrus, &c., cum Honorio, qui flammam hæretici dogmatis non, ut decuit Apostolicam auctoritatem, incipientem extinxit, sed negligendo confovit*. The fault of Honorius was one of negligence according to the words of the Pontiff, Leo the Second, but it was not an error of faith, much less an error in an *ex cathedra* statement. It is hardly necessary again to remind Dr. Littledale's readers that Infallibility does not mean or warrant sinlessness in him who possesses the gift.⁸

Dr. Littledale next mentions various instances in which Popes were deposed, and gives, amongst others, the names of Pope John the Twelfth, Benedict the Ninth, and John the

⁸ Palmieri, *De Rom. Pont.* p. 659.

Twenty-Third, and then he adds that all these depositions have been acknowledged as perfectly valid. Now we have no intention to weary our readers with historical disquisitions beside the point at issue, but we would seriously ask Dr. Littledale, What has deposition got to do with Infallibility? He devotes a section to Disproofs of Papal Infallibility, and then cites, as an instance of what he means, the deposition of various Pontiffs. This citation proves one thing most conclusively, that Dr. Littledale does not know what he is talking about. He is without even an elementary acquaintance with that theology on which he presumes to sit in judgment and to condemn. He mixes up Infallibility and Impeccability, and informs us that Roman Church history proves that the Popes were liable to punishment from their Superior, the collective Church, for any misconduct; contrary to the Vatican decrees, which allege that the Pope's decisions on faith and morals are "irreformable on their own merits, not by reason of approval by the whole Church."⁹ A more hopeless jumble than this can hardly be conceived. The Vatican Council, by the words quoted, speaks of the Pontiffs' *ex cathedra* definitions, and of those alone; it does not pretend to ascribe to the Roman Pontiff freedom from the infirmities that beset human nature in his private life, or in his personal opinions, or as temporal ruler, or in any capacity except one, namely, when he teaches definitively the whole Church on points of faith and morals.

Dr. Littledale next assures us that the Vatican decrees, in the third chapter of the Constitution *De Ecclesia*, claim expressly for the Pope the title of Universal Bishop, which former Pontiffs have uniformly refused to accept. There is not one word in the chapter alluded to by Dr. Littledale to justify such an assertion. The Vatican Council in the said chapter teaches that the Roman Pontiff has ordinary and immediate jurisdiction in every diocese and over every individual in each diocese throughout the world, but the Council is careful to add that this power of the Pope in no sense injures the jurisdiction ordinary and immediate of the bishops in their own respective dioceses, who, set by the Holy Ghost, have succeeded to the place of the Apostles as true pastors, subject to the Supreme Pastor, to feed and rule the Church of God. So far from explicitly saying, as Dr. Littledale pretends, that the Pope is Universal Bishop, the Council distinctly says the opposite.

⁹ P. 162.

Dr. Littledale winds up his Disproofs of Papal Infallibility with a reference to Clement the Fourteenth's Brief (not Bull, as Dr. Littledale calls it) suppressing the Society of Jesus in 1773. Dr. Littledale believes, or seems to believe, that the Brief of Clement the Fourteenth was *ex cathedra* teaching, and that some Jesuits, by retiring into Russia, showed their disbelief in the doctrine of Papal Infallibility. With nonsense such as this we find it difficult to be patient; but our concern is not for Dr. Littledale, but rather for those who in good faith may accept his assertions as true, and thus be kept away from that one true Church whose doctrines Dr. Littledale studiously misrepresents and assails.

Dr. Littledale, after showing most conclusively that he does not understand what is meant by the doctrine of Infallibility, next proceeds to establish that the said prerogative has been quite useless in the past. The proof he advances in support of this view is eminently characteristic of Dr. Littledale's ignorance. His words are: "If there have been a line of specially and divinely *inspired* heads of the Church endowed with the fulness of teaching as well as of ruling power, the proof ought to lie in a succession at Rome of great Fathers and Doctors of the Church, answering to the line of Jewish Prophets."¹⁰ No man with any acquaintance with the subject ever put the infallible utterances of the Pope on a level with the teaching of Isaiahs, Jeremias, or Daniel. Infallibility is one thing, inspiration another. Scripture is the Word of God pure and simple, a definition of the Pope or Church in Council is the word of a man, or a collection of men, divinely preserved from error. Catholics do not consider the definitions of the Church as inspired, and we defy Dr. Littledale to show the authority of even one writer of any distinction in theological schools that the definitions of Pope or Council are inspired. All that Dr. Littledale says about the comparatively small amount of theological knowledge possessed by the Popes, a matter on which Dr. Littledale is eminently qualified to judge, is completely beside the question at issue. Infallibility does not depend upon the learning of the Pontiff, or the researches of theologians, or the wisdom and sanctity of bishops. The Pope is indeed bound to use all ordinary precautions ere he publishes to the world a definition on faith or morals. By the very fact of Infallibility being due to the *assistance* of the Holy Spirit, it

¹⁰ P. 163.

supposes that the Pontiff will use all human means for arriving at a safe conclusion. Still, when the concluding step is taken and a doctrine on faith and morals is delivered by the Pontiff binding the whole Church, freedom from error in the enunciation of truth or the condemnation of what is wrong is ascribed not to the wisdom of Pope or Bishops, or to the vast learning of theologians, but simply and solely to the assistance of the Holy Ghost promised to the successors of St. Peter to shield them from error in teaching the whole Church on points that relate to belief or to action.

Dr. Littledale thinks that the Infallibility of the Popes has been useless in the past, because the great heresies have been put down by a Council or some great theologian. Dr. Littledale of course fails to see that the Councils never considered their decrees irreformable until they were solemnly approved or sanctioned by the Roman Pontiff. A Council and Pope possess in their decrees no more authority than the Pope when he defines without the aid of a Council. And if the Pontiffs have convoked Councils from time to time (nineteen during so many centuries are not a very considerable number), these very Councils have been only too willing to acknowledge the Infallibility of their head. At Nice, to which Dr. Littledale refers, in the Thirty-Ninth Canon,¹¹ the Pope is acknowledged to be Christ's Vicar over the whole Christian Church, and the penalty of excommunication falls on all who contradict him. Why does St. Cyril ask Pope Celestine to pronounce judgment on Nestorius, that all may with one mind adhere in one belief, unless the Pope were regarded as infallible in his teaching?¹² When St. Flavian condemned Eutyches as a heretic, why did Eutyches appeal to St. Leo unless he believed the Pontiff's ruling final and without appeal? Why did St. Flavian, writing to Leo, assure him that the Holy See alone would lead the people back to tranquillity and peace, adding these notable words: "The heresy that has arisen shall be most easily destroyed by your sacred letter—*Sic enim hæresis quæ surrexit, et turbæ quæ propter eam factæ sunt, facillime destruentur, Deo cooperante per vestras sacratissimas litteras*"?¹³ This occurred at Chalcedon, A.D. 451. Dr. Littledale will find the Infallibility of the Pope maintained

¹¹ Mansi, t. ii. *Conciliorum*, c. 497, edit. Florentiæ, 1759, quoted by Bouix, *De Papa*, v. i. p. 315.

¹² Bouix, *Ibid.* p. 344.

¹³ Labbe, t. iv. c. 14 et 15, edit. Parisiis, 1671.

by the Third Council of Constantinople in 680, and by the Fourth Council of Constantinople in 869, in terms to which the Vatican Council has referred in the fourth chapter of the Constitution on the Church.

From the schism of the Greeks in the ninth century to the rise of Scholasticism in the thirteenth, there was only one opinion amongst Catholics tolerated, that which professed the Infallibility of the Pontiff. The greatest light of the thirteenth century is the Angelical Doctor, St. Thomas of Aquin, who in the *Summa Theol.*¹⁴ says "that to the authority of the Roman Pontiff belongs once for all (*finaliter*) to determine the matters that relate to faith, that they may be held by all with unshaken faith." The Second Council of Lyons, held in 1274, and that of Florence in 1439, both declared the same truth. Dr. Littledale ought to know that there is not a single decree of a single Council, from Nice in 325 to the Vatican in 1870, which binds upon Catholics without the confirmation of the Roman Pontiff. And if the Popes have preferred to ask the aid of a Council in condemning heresies, instead of acting without their assistance, this mode of action has been dictated only by the desire that the unity of the Church in the teaching of truth or the condemnation of error might be all the more evident when it proceeds from the mouths of the representatives of all the Churches.

Now we come to a marvellously reckless assertion. "There is not one solitary example," says Dr. Littledale, "to be found in the whole of Church history of any great struggle or difficult question being decided by the Pope's interference." Let us examine this statement by the light of history. Of the Popes in the first ages, who were mostly martyrs, but little has been handed down to us. In the first centuries all the consequences bound up in the notion of the Primacy were not developed; but the idea remained ever the same, and ever did the Church possess and desire in the Primacy a centre of unity, and therefore the seat of Infallibility. The Infallibility of the Pontiff, even without a Council, was practically recognized in the question proposed by the Corinthians to Pope Clement in the lifetime of St. John the Apostle; in the efforts of heretics to obtain the protection of the Pope, as Valentinus, Marcion, Theodotus, Cleomenes; in the journey of St. Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, to Pope Anicetas; in the Epistle of Pope Soter, held

¹⁴ 2. 2. q. 1. a. 10.

at Corinth in as much reverence as that of Clement's. History has preserved to us few and scanty records of the early history of the Church, yet even these tend to show that the Pontiff *per sese* was considered an infallible judge of the faith. Pope Zephyrinus, in the beginning of the third century, pronounced the final sentence of condemnation against the Montanists, and condemned their tenets as heretical. This sentence was admitted even by Tertullian as peremptory, and that in his work *De Pudicitia*, when he wrote as a Montanist. About the same time various sects arose in the Church with false views about the Trinity. They represented three Persons as simply names of God, taught a kind of monarchy in the Trinity, and consequently denied the Divinity of Christ. These errors were authoritatively condemned by Pope Victor, and excommunication was pronounced against the leader, Theodotus of Byzantium. Sabellianism was condemned in the middle of the third century by Pope Dionysius. The Council of Nice, says Dr. Littledale, settled the question of Arianism. St. Athanasius distinctly says that Arianism had been condemned by Pope Dionysius before Nicæa. The doctrine of the Consubstantiality of the Word with the Father was considered as a doctrine of faith, and the contrary opinion as heretical, even before the Council sat. When, at the opening of the Council, Arius began to explain his tenets, the Bishops stopped their ears and pronounced them heretical. We have now reached the year 325, and the genuine Papal decretals that have been preserved begin, says Cardinal Hergenröther, with the year 385. Yet by means of scanty records, even at this early period we have proved the falseness of Dr. Littledale's assertion, that there is not one solitary example of a difficult question being decided by the Pope's interference. From the fifth century upwards the incorrectness of Dr. Littledale's words are still more distinctly seen. As Pope Celestine condemned the heresy of Nestorius, so Leo the Great checked that of Eutyches, and gave to the whole Church that most luminous exposition of the doctrine of the Incarnation, which Bossuët spoke of as one *qui a fait l'admiration de toute la terre*. This was given to the world in the shape of a letter to Flavian, Patriarch of Constantinople. St. Leo unquestionably considered this letter as an *ex cathedra* statement. For not only did the Pontiff oblige Eutyches to adhere in every particular to his ruling, but he ordered the Fathers, assembled at Ephesus by command of Theodosius, not

to examine the doctrines of Eutyches, but to condemn them as heretical. By so doing the Pope clearly showed that he did not consider his letter as reformable by the Council of Ephesus, or of doubtful authority; on the contrary, he considered the Synod bound to execute his orders and to enforce his decrees. Then why call the Council at Ephesus at all? First, it was summoned, not by the Pope, but by Theodosius with the Pope's consent; secondly, Leo assigns the reason by these words—*Ut pleniori judicio possit error aboleri*. The solemn judgment of a General Council is obviously, because of the consent of the Fathers, a signal proof of the unity of belief in the condemnation of error.

The history of the Iconoclast heresy affords another instance of Dr. Littledale's ignorance of history and perversion of facts. Constantine Copronymus convened a Synod of three hundred and thirty-eight Bishops at Constantinople, and forced them to bow to his will against their better judgment. Germanus, Patriarch of Constantinople, turned to Gregory the Second (A.D. 715—731) for counsel and help. The Pontiff, in a letter to the Patriarch, explained the Catholic doctrine of veneration of images, and defined what was to be believed on the subject. The same Pope, in two other letters to the Emperor Leo, upbraided him as a heretic for having destroyed the images of Christ and His saints, and rejected the proposal of a Council on the ground of its uselessness. Why was a General Council useless unless the matter had been once for all settled by the Pope's own letters? The Pontiff further insisted on the Emperor's obligation to obey, and not to command, in matters of faith. Gregory the Second not only set forth the Catholic dogma to instruct the Eastern Church, but also, in a Synod held at Rome, solemnly condemned the Iconoclastic errors. His successors followed in his steps, and the new heresy was condemned by Gregory the Third, Zachary, Paul the First, and Stephen the Second. Although the controversy concerning sacred images was finally settled by three Pontifical acts, and Catholic truth clearly explained on the points that had been controverted, still so many scandals had arisen in the Oriental Church that, at the request of Tarasius, Patriarch of Constantinople, the Seventh General Council, or the Second of Nice, was convened by Pope Adrian the First in 787. And now we come to a clear exercise of Papal Infallibility. Tarasius had forwarded to the Pontiff a profession of Catholic faith. The Pontiff in reply accepts this profession, and at the same time declares the

doctrine of the Iconoclasts to be heretical, and he solemnly defines the opposite doctrine to be Catholic, and the tradition of Christian antiquity. All this, be it remembered, was done before the Fathers met in Council. The Pontiff imposed on the Patriarch the duty of persuading the Emperor to declare the pseudo-Synod held against sacred images as null and void. "For," he goes on to say, "the gates of Hell shall not prevail against the Church." And again: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I shall build My Church." That Adrian wished to impose a rule of faith is proved by these words: "*Nostræ et Apostolicæ sedis sacram et orthodoxam formam ex profundo cordis et sinceritate mentis custodire.*" The Patriarch of Constantinople, to whom the language is addressed, is required by the Pope to give inward assent of mind and heart to the doctrine laid down. No such obedience could be demanded from a Patriarch of the second see in the Church on the eve of an Ecumenical Council unless the doctrine were already a rule of faith, or unless the person who taught it was infallible. Further, the Pope distinctly says that the Council was called under the hope that the heretics might yield before such an august assemblage of Bishops, representatives each of the faith of his own diocese, and collectively of the faith of the Church. Besides, the conduct of the Fathers in the Seventh Synod is proof conclusive that they regarded the Iconoclastic tenets as heretical, even before any decrees had been passed. For some of the Bishops who had signed the decree of Copronymus presented to the Council their profession of faith, that they might be united with the centre of Catholic unity. They were received as converts from heresy. Thus we have a clear and unmistakeable sign that the Council considered it heresy to condemn the veneration of images. Consequently the Fathers admitted that the rule of faith had been fixed before they had assembled, and the letters of Adrian mentioned above were confirmed by the Bishops, in accordance with the usual practice of Synods.

But we have many other instances of the action of the Roman Pontiffs in condemning heresies without the aid of a Council. Berengarius denied that in the Eucharist the bread and wine was changed into the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ. Gregory the Seventh, in 1079, obliged Berengarius to believe *corde et ore* the doctrine of the Real Presence, and to take an oath on the Gospel in token of his belief. But an

obligation to submit our reason in matters of doctrine can only be imposed by an infallible authority. Again, St. Bernard, in 1140, asked Innocent the Second to condemn the teaching of Abelard. We give the Pontiff's judgment in his own words, as affording even to those who are as blind as Dr. Littledale another instance of *ex cathedrâ* teaching enforced by the Pontiff alone without a Council. The italics are ours: "Nos itaque qui in Cathedra Sancti Petri, cui a Domino dictum est, et tu aliquando conversus confirma fratres tuos, licet indigni residere conspicimur, communicato fratrum nostrorum Episcoporum Cardinalium consilio, destinata nobis a vestra discretione capitula et universa ipsius Petri dogmata, Sanctorum Canonum auctoritate, cum suo auctore damnamus *eique tamquam hæretico* perpetuum silentium imposuimus. *Universos* quoque erroris sui sectatores et defensores a fidelium consortio sequestrandos et excommunicationis vinculo innodandos esse censemus." If Dr. Littledale desires an example of *ex cathedrâ* teaching, he may with profit study these words of Innocent the Second. They fulfil the conditions imposed by the Council of the Vatican. First, the Pontiff speaks from the Chair of Peter; secondly, he refers to Christ's promises as his guarantee against error in finally deciding some point of doctrine; thirdly, he brands Abelard as a heretic because of his views, and condemns his entire doctrine; fourthly, he banishes *all* those who cling to what has been authoritatively condemned from the fold of the faithful. We maintain that the above declaration of Innocent the Second is unquestionably *ex cathedrâ*.

And now let us pass on to modern times. The Roman Pontiffs have never tolerated any practical doubt of their infallibility, they have gone even further, for they would not allow without protest their decrees to be judged by the Bishops of the Church, even though the judgment resulted in an act of submission. "Who has made you judges over us?" wrote Clement the Eleventh, A.D. 1706, to the Bishops of France. "Is it for inferiors to pass decrees about the authority of their Superior and to examine his judgment? . . . Ask your forefathers, and they will tell you that it is not for individual bishops to discuss, but to execute, the decrees of the Apostolic See. . . . Assuredly if you had considered even the form of the Apostolic Constitution by which We impose with Apostolic authority upon all Archbishops and Bishops the execution and full observance of this same Constitution, you would have

learned that We in this matter neither ask your counsel nor request your suffrages, nor await your opinion, but that We impose the obedience which at your consecration you promised by solemn oath to pay to Blessed Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and the Holy Roman Church, and to Us and Our decrees and commands." This is pretty plain speaking to some French Bishops with ridiculous and extravagant notions of their own powers; and the Pope, Dr. Littledale will please to notice, is speaking about a dogmatic Constitution in which he had declared the decrees of the Gallican Assembly of 1682 null and void. The Bishops accepted the Constitution only after examination, an experiment they were not likely to repeat after the reprimand they received. Lastly, the Jansenists themselves have by the Constitution *Vineam Domini*, in 1705, unwittingly afforded Clement the Eleventh an opportunity of proving once again to the world that the Holy See, without the aid of a Council, can and does condemn all heresy and misbelief. The teaching of Jansenius was condemned in five propositions. The Jansenists never for a moment thought of publicly disobeying or questioning the Pontiff's right to condemn, but they held that they were bound to pay exterior obedience only to the Papal ruling, without interior assent of heart and will. Clement the Eleventh in the *Vineam Domini*, in what he calls a *perpetuo valitura Constitutione*, teaches that "all the faithful are bound to condemn as heretical, not by word only but in their heart—*non ore solum, sed et corde recipi ac damnari*—the sense of Jansenius as given in the five propositions. And with these facts, out of many not mentioned, patent in history, Dr. Littledale has ventured to say that there is not one solitary example to be found in the whole of Church history of any difficult question being decided by a Pope's interference without the aid of a Council. Dr. Littledale is kind enough to assure us that according to some Roman theologians the Popes have only *once* spoken with the formalities necessary for *ex cathedra* definition, and that when Pius the Ninth decreed our Lady's Immaculate Conception,¹⁵ yet even for such an important measure no Council was convened. Dr. Littledale's statements are proved to be false by his own confession.

But Dr. Littledale has not finished yet. He thinks he has discovered some break-downs (to use his own expression) in Infallibility, and he puts forward as an instance the worn-out

¹⁵ P. 167.

case of Galileo. Answers have been made to this difficulty over and over again, and our readers would not thank us for repeating a thrice-told tale. We shall offer only a few observations. Decrees of the Congregation of the Inquisition have no claim to Infallibility unless the Pontiff makes them his own, and publishes them to the Church with all those objective notes declared by the Council of the Vatican necessary in order to indicate a definition *ex cathedrâ*. The Pope cannot transfer to any man or to any number of men the prerogative of Infallibility. It is an inalienable privilege. There can be no exercise of Infallibility unless when the Pope judges and pronounces by an act of his own mind. The Pope can if he chooses use the Congregation of the Inquisition as a means of publishing his dogmatic decrees to the world; in that case those decrees must bear on their face the clear and unmistakeable proof that they are the expression of the mind of the Supreme Pontiff, by which he binds the whole Church in points of faith and morals. But the decrees of a Congregation, simply confirmed by the Pope, are not therefore *ex cathedrâ*. A general confirmation even by the supreme authority of the Pontiff does not convert the decrees of a Congregation into an *ex cathedrâ* judgment, for by such general approval the Pope does not make the decrees his own, and unless they be his they have no claim to Infallibility. It must be the Pope acting over me and not any one else who prescribes the rule of faith; and the Pope's intention of defining a doctrine to be held by the whole Church must be clearly shown by those marks or signs mentioned by the Council of the Vatican, which are as unchangeable as the doctrine itself.

It is true that the Congregation acts, as Dr. Littledale supposes, in virtue of the supreme authority of the Pontiff. But not every measure emanating from the supreme authority of the Pope shares necessarily his Infallibility. The granting of indulgences, privileges, dispensations, decrees of beatification, are all occasions when the Pope exercises his supreme power, yet we have never heard it maintained that Infallibility had any part in indulgences, privileges, and dispensations, and whether the Pope be infallible in beatification remains an open question. But it may be asked, what force have those decrees of the Inquisition in which there is no mention of the Pontiff? They bind to external obedience only; but do not command the inward assent of faith. They deserve respect and veneration,

because they represent the judgment of eminent and trained theologians, as well as obedience, because to the members of the Congregation the Pontiff delegates some of his authority ; but Infallibility he cannot so delegate ; he can if he chooses make the judgment of the Cardinals his own ; and then the decision may be considered *ex cathedrâ* if it bind the whole Church, not because it proceeds from the Congregation, but because it is the act of the Pope. By the light of these observations we thus explain the Galileo case. We are quite free to admit that the tribunal of the Inquisition made a mistake in the condemnation of Galileo and the Copernican system, and further, that the Inquisition acted unjustly and exceeded its powers in forcing Galileo, not only to outward obedience, but to exterior assent of mind and heart in abandoning a doctrine now admitted to be true. It was clearly within the powers of the Congregation to forbid for prudential grounds a certain doctrine from being taught, even though that doctrine were not recognized as false ; but only an infallible authority, which by itself the Inquisition is not, has a right to enforce inward assent to the truth of its decrees. An error of a Congregation proves nothing against the Infallibility of the Pope, unless the Pontiff has made his own the erroneous decree or ruling. But no proof has ever been given that the condemnation of Galileo has been confirmed by Brief, or Bull, or Letters Apostolic, or that any Pontiff has made that ruling his own, and by definition imposed it on the Universal Church. There is no mention of the Pontiff in the decree of the Congregation of March 5, 1616, which held as false and heretical the opinion that the sun was stationary while the earth moved. Nor in the sentence of condemnation passed on Galileo is the Pope's name anywhere to be seen. There are the signatures of seven Cardinals, but there is no reference whatever to the Holy Father. If Galileo's condemnation has been considered the act of the Pope *ex cathedrâ*, and therefore final and irrevocable, how comes it that some of the learned of the day, strenuous opponents of the system to whom Galileo's condemnation was a triumph, recognize in the judgment merely the voice of the Cardinals and not an utterance of the Holy See ? Riccioli, a Jesuit astronomer of eminence, almost a contemporary of Galileo, combats his system through two hundred and ten pages, and yet is bound to admit that the Congregation of Cardinals, viewed apart from the Pope, cannot

draw up propositions which are of faith, even when it defines that they are of faith, and the contrary are heretical. Since up to this time there has not appeared a definition of the Sovereign Pontiff, or of a Council directed and approved by him, so up to this, Riccioli goes on to say, "it is not of faith that the sun moves and that the earth is stationary merely by the authority of the Congregation, but at most only by the authority of Holy Scripture to those to whom it is morally certain that God has revealed this doctrine." Tromond, Professor at Louvain, writing in 1631 and 1634, denied the Infallibility of these decrees; and in 1661, Talin, Grand Penitentiary in Rome, states that the voice of the Church had not been heard in the Galileo case; and Magalotti, a friend of Galileo, writing to him in 1632, at the moment when his work the *Dialogo* was causing so much stir, consoled Galileo by reminding him that even though the majority of the Congregation were of opinion that the view was false, nevertheless there would be no intervention of the supreme authority, and he stated this to be the mind of those who take part in the Congregation of the Holy Office. In 1676, Cardinal Lobkowitz, a strong opponent of the Copernican system, discusses the value of the decrees of a Roman Congregation, taking for example those that concern the movement of the earth, and maintains that even were it hereafter proved that the sun is stationary while the earth revolves, still it could not be said that the Church had gone wrong, for the contrary doctrine had never been proposed as an article of faith to the Universal Church by a General Council, or by the Pontiff speaking *ex cathedrâ*.¹⁶ To sum up then in one word, the condemnation of Galileo was an act of the Inquisition alone; it was not the work of the Pope, therefore it was not *ex cathedrâ*, and the mistake made by the Congregation is no obstacle to the doctrine of Papal Infallibility.

We are getting to the close of Dr. Littledale's wearying list. His last objection is drawn from an edition of the Vulgate given to the world by Sixtus the Fifth in 1590, which so swarmed with errors, according to Dr. Littledale, that it was called in almost immediately. The facts are these. In the Bull *Æternus ille*, which he prefixed to the edition of the Vulgate, Sixtus the Fifth states that in the present edition he had endeavoured, after

¹⁶ See an Article in the *Controverse* for December 16, 1880, by Professor Gilbert of Louvain. Vitte et Perrussal, 3, Place Bellecour, Lyons.

due consideration, to publish a text of the Bible as free as possible (*prout optime fieri potuit*) from errors. This task the Pontiff claims to have executed in virtue of the authority which he received in Peter, to whom constancy in faith had been promised by Christ, and who was bidden to strengthen his brethren. The present edition was issued *ex certa scientia et plenitudine Apostolicæ potestatis*, and he meant it to be recognized as that Vulgate declared by the Council of Trent to be authentic. How came it then, as Dr. Littledale might ask, that the edition was called in and the Bull *Æternus ille* revoked and suppressed? What becomes of Sixtus the Fifth's appeal to the words of Christ promising infallibility to Peter in the very work under notice, if that work was swarming with errors? Before answering briefly this objection, we premise that from the words of Christ it can be shown that the Roman Pontiff has the right of correcting an edition of the Bible, and of passing final judgment upon it, and also it can be proved that such an edition would be in substantial agreement with the original and free from error in faith or morals. The corrected edition of Sixtus the Fifth contained no error in faith or morals, though we readily admit not a few blemishes and imperfections were discovered in it, due we suppose to the indiscreet zeal that led to its publication contrary to the advice of Cardinals Carafa and Bellarmine. When Dr. Littledale speaks about the work swarming with errors, does he speak about errors in faith or morals, or in other matters where the Church does not claim to judge infallibly? Sixtus the Fifth never offered the edition as perfect; he expressly supposes the presence of inaccuracies by introducing the clause, *prout optime fieri potuit*. Therefore in one word we reply that Sixtus the Fifth, in the Bull *Æternus ille*, appealed to the words of Christ as a pledge to the faithful that there was no diversity from the original text in what related to faith or morals; but he never pretended that the edition was in all respects correct, or that it could not be made much more perfect.

Having concluded his disproofs, as he terms them, of Papal Infallibility, Dr. Littledale characteristically assures us, as we before said, that it is maintained by some Roman theologians that the Popes have up to the present only spoken once with the formalities necessary to make their utterances *ex cathedrâ*, and that when Pius the Ninth declared our Lady's Immaculate

Conception a dogma of faith.¹⁷ Who these eminent theologians are who hold such a strange view, Dr. Littledale does not condescend to state. But he at least does not agree with them, else he would not have introduced so many instances in which Infallibility is made to break down. But throughout Dr. Littledale shows one thing most conclusively, that he does not know what is understood by Infallibility in the sense of the Catholic Church.

In the next section, "Papal Infallibility no help in the Future," Dr. Littledale reiterates his assertion that what the doctrine comes to really is this: "that all decisions of the Pope in faith and morals, being divinely inspired and infallible, become, when committed to writing, so much Holy Scripture. It does not mean less than this; and it cannot mean more."¹⁸ This statement is as incorrect as it can be.¹⁹ Bellarmine is not likely to undervalue the definition of the Church, and yet he devotes some space to show in how many ways Scripture is superior to definitions of Pope or Council. The first motive of superiority lies in this, that Scripture is inspired, while the definition is not. Dr. Littledale cannot quote even one theologian of any weight to support such an unfounded statement. "Never," says Perrone, in a passage quoted by Cardinal Newman in his *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk*, "have Catholics taught that the gift of Infallibility is given by God to the Church after the manner of inspiration." And yet one would have thought that Dr. Littledale must have read this letter, and seen this statement by Perrone. Dr. Littledale, after making Infallibility to be what it is not, proceeds to show its uselessness to men in general, because in the ordinary circumstances of life we apply for the solution of a doubt to a confessor, or theologian, or bishop, or Roman Congregation, or to the Pope himself in his capacity of private doctor—all fallible authorities. What, then, is the use of Infallibility? We answer, that Infallibility is not necessary for the solution of every doubt or the removal of every difficulty. A Catholic has many helps to guide him with moral certainty in his relations towards God, his neighbour, society, and in his

¹⁷ Dr. Littledale says that the Immaculate Conception was denied as heretical by fourteen Popes. Even supposing, which we cannot for a moment admit, this fact to be true, did these Popes give their own private views, or speak *ex cathedra*? The former alternative does not help Dr. Littledale, and if the latter be correct, why not cite the words of the decree?

¹⁸ P. 168.

¹⁹ *Controv.* tom. ii. l. ii. c. 2.

duties to himself. A Catholic has standard works containing rules of belief and practice approved by the Church, his confessor, ecclesiastical superiors, good friends round about him, and, lastly, conscience—the echo of God's voice commanding what is there and then to be done, what is there and then to be avoided. The Sunday sermon at Mass will explain to a practical Catholic his many duties, while the special obligations of his state are most easily pointed out in private by the confessor. A fallible person, Dr. Littledale will cry out. Fallible the confessor unquestionably is; yet the penitent may be morally certain that the instruction and guidance he obtains are correct and for the best. More than this moral certainty we do not require very often, and even that we cannot always obtain. But an ordinary Catholic knows that his confessor has enjoyed special advantages of training, that the Church supposes him to have acquired such knowledge as will enable him at least to solve ordinary cases that come before him, and to doubt about the more difficult. The confessor is guided by the decisions of the Holy See, the teaching of theologians, by recognized authorities, by the practices of holy men, by the rules of Christian prudence. The Catholic does not expect more than God has promised to give, and God has not told us to expect infallible guidance in every action of life. We act according to our lights, and keep as best we can the ordinances of the Church, and serve God with our heartiest endeavour. There is in every diocese a bishop, who is, by excellence, after the Pope the one authentic teacher in his diocese, to whom in virtue of his office belongs to instruct the faithful, and especially to explain to them the drift and application of all decrees of faith and morals that come from the Holy See. Such explanation is admittedly not infallible; nevertheless, it comes from one appointed by God to feed the sheep intrusted to his care. And in practice its correctness is tested by its agreement with that of other bishops throughout the Church on all essential points, and by the fact of escaping animadversions from the Sovereign Pontiff. For it is morally certain that no bishop could now teach to his people clearly and unmistakeably anything contrary to the received doctrine of the Church without receiving prompt and severe correction. Lastly, fairly educated men can read for themselves any *ex cathedra* decrees, duly authenticated as such—for them, belief or action is certain within the lines laid down. Should difficulties arise, explanation can be had; if opinions

vary as to what is or what is not the Church's rule of belief or action in any matter, then a Catholic avails himself of the maxim, *lex dubia non obligat*. The same authority that makes the law is ever at hand to give its interpretation; the maxim, *ejus est interpretari cujus est condere*, holds for Papal decrees as for other enactments. Dr. Littledale's objection, that there is no real safeguard against error in having an infallible teacher, unless his disciples be also infallible hearers, if true, would have told equally in favour of the Jews when they listened to our Lord's discourses. They rejected His doctrine, and were, as Christ said, without excuse. "If I had not come and spoken to them they would have no sin, but now they have no excuse for their sin."²⁰ The Catholic knows that, under certain circumstances and in certain conditions clearly and closely defined, Christ has promised to His Vicar freedom from error in teaching; once the Catholic is convinced that the Pope has spoken, the way is clear: and then refusal to obey is without excuse.

One or two remarks more ere we finish with this part of our subject. Dr. Littledale assures us that Roman theologians (the names are prudently concealed) are now at hopeless variance on three questions raised by the decree on Infallibility: (1) When does the Pope speak *ex cathedrâ*? (2) How is the fact to be known publicly? (3) What is that infallibility in kind or degree mentioned? We entirely deny that theologians are at variance on any of these questions, which are fully discussed in all manuals of theology. We deny that there is, especially since the Vatican Council, any variance in the abstract on what is required for an *ex cathedrâ* utterance, though on rare occasions in a particular case it is difficult to determine whether a Pontifical decree be *ex cathedrâ* or not. Thus theologians are not agreed to what extent the decree of Eugenius the Fourth on behalf of the Armenians be disciplinary or dogmatic. But this must necessarily occur in all human measures. Difficulties have been much lessened by the Council of the Vatican, which defined the meaning of the term *ex cathedrâ*, and whatever doubts there may be are ten times less than in explaining the reach of our own laws and Acts of Parliament; for has not the glorious uncertainty of the law passed into a proverb? As lawyers interpret Acts of Parliament, so to theologians belong the doctrinal interpretation of all acts that emanate from the Holy See; the Bishops, because of their office, can give an

²⁰ St. John xv. 22.

authentic explanation, and finally, when necessity obliges, the Pope can himself clear away any obscurity that may have clouded his words. The doctrine of Papal Infallibility is not considered in theology a question of much difficulty, at least by those who have studied the subject with any care; but Dr. Littledale has afforded in his own person an example of the egregious blunders made by a writer in discussing points of Catholic belief whose meaning he does not understand.

Dr. Littledale winds up his remarks on this subject by misrepresenting what Catholics hold on Development. In this, as in so many other cases, Dr. Littledale does not seem to comprehend the question which he treats.²¹ He says first, development is only a modern excuse put forward by private persons in the attempt to get out of a difficulty and a contradiction. But the authoritative assertion of the Roman Church itself is that its teaching now is exactly what it has been from the beginning. Dr. Littledale then quotes Trent and the Vatican Council, which speak of faith as *semper eadem*. Then he adds: "There may be unwholesome developments of things that were right at first, which ought to be discarded. So wine will develop under unfavourable circumstances into vinegar; but the Roman Church will not allow vinegar to be used for the Eucharist. Thirdly, there are usages and doctrines now current which are not developments at all, but blank contradictions of the ancient faith and practice. The worship of St. Joseph differs from the doctrine of the Church as a huge tumour does from the ordinary condition of the body." After quoting Dr. Littledale's words, that we may not seem unfair, we proceed briefly to set down what the Church means by development.

The Catholic Church, as Dr. Littledale remarks, maintains that its teaching now is exactly what it has been from the beginning. Yes; its teaching never *contradicts* what it has authoritatively taught in other ages, but it may be on certain points much clearer, fuller, more explicit now than ever it was before. The belief of Catholics is ever the same, that is, the Church never denies what she has once taught, nor can she ever teach, or by her universal practice sanction in matters of faith or morals, what she may hereafter deny or repudiate. The prerogative of Infallibility has been granted to her simply and solely that she may guard and faithfully transmit the body of doctrine intrusted to her on the death of the last Apostle.

²¹ P. 171.

Catholic theologians teach that no new revelation affecting the doctrine that binds on the belief of all has been given to the Church since the hour when St. John yielded his virgin soul to God. The Church can neither add nor take one jot or tittle from that body of truth which as a sacred heirloom was left to Peter and the Apostles, by them to be handed on to their successors until the second coming of our Lord. That doctrine is found in the books of the Old and New Testament, which the Church regards as the Word of God, and in tradition, that is, in those unwritten sayings received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ, or which the Apostles themselves have mentioned at the direct inspiration of the Holy Ghost, Who has kept them sound and intact in the Church. It would be impossible for sayings and truths to pass from mouth to mouth during a long period without being much changed in the process were it not for the perpetual assistance of the Holy Spirit, that overshadows clergy and people in subjection to the Roman Pontiff, guarding them through him, and because of their union with him, from all error in faith. Dr. Littledale admits that when heresies have arisen in the Church, the Supreme Pontiff and Bishops in communion with him have examined Scripture and the writings of the Fathers. Every practice and creed is sanctioned or condemned according to the relation that it bears to the faith as handed down by the Apostles. From the First Council of Nice, in 325, to the Council of the Vatican, in 1870, the same truth is ever inculcated, that the assistance of the Holy Ghost has been promised to the successors of St. Peter, not that they might find out some new doctrine by some fresh revelation, but that they might religiously guard and faithfully explain the Apostolic revelation or the deposit of faith intrusted to their keeping. Novelty is suspected and shunned, antiquity is followed and prized.

Our faith is identical with that professed by the Apostles. They clearly recognized all the dogmas that ever have been defined, or that ever can be defined, by Pope or Council. They taught them all to their disciples, though not necessarily in all the fulness of form in which they are viewed now. It is quite true that from time to time the Church defines some truths which Catholics in previous ages were not obliged to believe. Before 1854 it was not an article of Catholic faith that our Lady was sinless in conception; nor before July 1870, that the Pope, singly and apart from his brethren in the Episco-

pate, is ever free from error when he teaches the whole Church on points of faith or morals. Yet nowhere is the Church's oneness of belief seen more clearly than in these supposed diversities, which we consider as development of doctrine. The Church is not dead. She is made up of living members. She is a living body. Since the Church lives, growth is the very law of her life. But this growth, while it implies development and expansion, forbids all change. The growth of a body is the best proof of its life and health. As ages glide by, the full force, consequence, and meaning of the truth, hitherto imperfectly apprehended, is brought out by the labour of theologians, the discussions of the schools, the writings of the Fathers, and the decrees of Councils. "Such development is nothing but the new form, explanation, or carrying out of what in substance was held from the first, what the Apostles have said but have not recorded in writing, or would necessarily have said in our circumstances, or if they had been asked, or in view of certain uprisings of error, and in that sense really portions of that legacy of truth of which the Church in all her members, but more especially in her hierarchy, is the divinely appointed trustee."²²

It belongs to the Church from time to time, as she thinks fit, to tell the world all that is bound up in any truth of Catholic belief which without such declaration would either be hidden or misunderstood. In brief, all that the Church does is to draw forth, illustrate, make clear, confirm, or apply to particular concrete instances, what has been already revealed. The Church can neither discover, nor add, nor change. Whole and entire she has received a body of truth from her Founder, whole and entire she will keep it. That doctrine which the Church has to guard in itself never changes and never increases, our knowledge of it may grow clearer, and does increase. We willingly allow that certain doctrines now declared of Catholic faith were not clearly recognized by certain portions of the Church. Either they were not clearly contained in Scripture, or the voice of tradition seemed indistinct. The Church meanwhile kept silent. It is not always prudent to exercise an act of supreme authority. Her theologians read, and wrote, and discussed, missionaries preached, holy souls prayed. Circumstances arose that compelled her to speak with no wavering voice. The Church can never define what was at any time unknown to the

²² Cardinal Newman's *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk*, First Edition, p. 105.

whole body of the faithful. She may and she does define certain doctrines which portions of the Church, even in communion with Rome, have either doubted or denied. Once Rome speaks, controversy ceases; to the teaching of the Supreme Pontiff all bend, and from his ruling there is no appeal. The two hundred millions of Catholics now spread all over the earth have all one faith. They believe what the Apostles held, though not with that clearness, preciseness, definiteness which the Apostles possessed because of their extraordinary endowments. Those that come after us can never be asked to hold anything at variance with what the Church now teaches, or with what she sanctions by her universal practice. For them the truths of faith may be far clearer than for us, their reach may be more widely seen, their connection more fully grasped; what are now considered only safe and probable opinions, may hereafter be binding on the belief of all as necessary portions of the Creed. But never can the Church, through the mouth of Pope or Council, contradict what she has once taught, or permit, as Dr. Littledale falsely asserts, doctrines which are not developments at all, but blank contradictions of the ancient faith. Heresies will always exist, and usages and tenets will ever be in vogue in certain portions of the Church which she can never allow. For these the Church is not responsible. Her doctrines are taught by her universal practice, by the solemn definitions of her Head, by the daily, hourly, and no less binding teaching of her ordinary *magisterium*—the Bishops of the Catholic world in union with the Holy See. Nor can the Pope, as Dr. Littledale may suppose, at his caprice and good pleasure make such and such a doctrine the object of a dogmatic definition. The Pope is tied up and limited to the Divine revelation, and to the truths contained in, legitimately flowing from, or necessary to the guardianship of that revelation. The Pope is bound by existing creeds and preceding definitions. In matters of faith and morals the Pope cannot change or sanction at his arbitrary decision. He is merely trustee and guardian of the doctrine our Lord gave, which by the Divine assistance will always be safe in the keeping of the Pope.

M. GAVIN.

of St. Malo to the right and receives the opposite extremity of the natural rocky fortification which encloses it seawards. Now we are nearing the stern barrier, and as the summer sea breaks suddenly into foam over many a hidden rock, we realize the perils of this passage to the uninitiated. It is high tide and the lighthouse which we have seen to rise out of the depths of the clear green sea, as it stands on the extremity of a long line of curved rocks hung with a tawny mane of sea-weed which closes in the day and leaves only one

Saint Malo.

THE tramp of feet, the rumble of chains on deck, and the bright sunlight through a port, stir us up from an unsatisfactory slumber, and we scramble up on to the deck of the South-Western steamboat, bound for St. Malo from Southampton. We had seen the tall chalk cliffs of the Isle of Wight fade away into the night like dim spectres some nine hours ago, and now before us, faint on the horizon, lies the blue outline of the coast of Brittany. As the good ship presses forward through the long lazy swell of the half sleeping sea, leaving behind her a widening path of sparkling foam, the white-breasted sea-gulls sailing over it, the morning sun little by little strikes on the coast line, and one by one grow out of the purple distance its details of headland and bay, of dark cliff and golden strand, of villages nestling along the shore, and church towers rising faintly amidst the silver haze of morning. Let us try to distinguish these varied incidents of the scene, which every minute becomes more striking in its beauty and its boldness as we approach it.

Far away to the west tower up, dimly tinted with rose-coloured light, the red cliffs of Cap Frehel, with its twin lighthouses, and apparently just below it, but really terminating a second bay, the picturesque fortifications of the Fort de la Latte cling to the rugged coast. The Baie de la Frenay breaks deep into the line, and against its shadow the promontory of St. Cast stands forward in bright contrast. Then comes a sweep of yellow sands, from which rise storm-washed islets and pinnacles of granite, and the coast line runs on again till the Pointe du Décollé juts boldly out to sea, and marks the beginning of the weird and terrible line of rocks which hem in the entrance to St. Malo. Turning now to the east, the Pointe de Grouin is sharply defined against the faint distance of the Normandy coast, and much nearer, the bold headland of the Pointe de la Varde, crowned by its fort, closes in the roadstead

of St. Malo to the right, and receives the opposite extremity of the natural rocky fortification which encircles it seawards.

Now we are nearing the stern barrier, and as the summer sea breaks suddenly into foam over many a hidden rock, we realize the perils of this passage to the uninitiated. It is high tide, and the lighthouse which we pass seems to rise out of the depths of the clear green water. But at the ebb it stands on the extremity of a long line of rugged rocks hung with a tawny mane of sea-weed, which closes in the bay, and leaves only one passage practicable for any but the merest fishing-boats, excepting under the condition of unusual tides. High above the highest tides, however—and these rise to the extraordinary height of from forty-five to fifty feet—tower up from the deep sea great masses of storm-washed rock, like advanced posts, and indeed, six of them have been used for the purposes of fortification, and are crowned by granite strongholds planned by Vauban. Cézembre, which has almost the proportions of an island, is the most striking of these outlying posts, and as we pass it we can almost distinguish, in strange contrast, the hermit cell of St. Brandon, and the gleam of the cannon of the battery crowning its rugged summit. Of the sublimity of this scene under the influence of storm, it is more easy to form an idea than to express it, but the vivid description of the Breton poet, Brizeux, comes up to the utmost perfection of word painting.

Ils étaient là, les rocs, pêle-mêle et sans nombre,
 Devant eux sur la mer projetant leur grande ombre ;
 Les flots couraient sur eux avec leurs mille bras,
 Cabrés contre les flots, ils ne reculaient pas ;
 Hérissés, mugissants, inondés de poussière,
 Ensemble ils secouaient leur humide crinière,
 De leur masse difforme ils effrayaient les yeux ;
 L'oreille s'emplissait de leurs cris furieux ;
 Et l'homme tout entier, en face de ces roches,
 Sentait qu'il avait peur.

And now we are within this almost unique *enceinte*, and another scene presents itself to us. Right ahead, where the cliffs part, and run down clothed with verdure to the water's edge, the River Rance flows out into the sea. The headland to the right, dotted with lofty dwellings, which stretches away along the sea coast and up the entrance to the river, is the site of Dinard, the fashionable resort of the *beau-monde*. The massive bluff forming the other side of the mouth of the river, with its weather-stained rocks below blending with the bastions

and curtains of an imposing fortress on their crests, is the Fort de la Cité, the ancient Aleth, of which we shall have more to say. Springing from the foot of this latter headland, the town of St. Servan sweeps round its desolate little bay, its scattered and irregular houses surmounted by the clumsy tower of its church, the tall spire of the Orphanage Chapel of St. Joseph, and the group of steep roofs and belfry of its Hotel de Ville. The imposing mass of the gray granite walls of the harbour drop down towards the horizon with a dense background of verdure and grey-roofed houses, and to our left the town of St. Malo rises out of its girdle of machicolated and turreted walls. High above these fortifications, which seawards are rooted in the granite rocks, but towards the port are lined with busy quays, are crowded the tall roofs of the houses of the merchant princes of old St. Malo, with their tiers of dormer windows and lofty and characteristic chimney-shafts. From amidst this confused and irregular mass of dwellings, with its broad effects of light and shade, its sober tints of weather-stained granite, the grey of the high-pitched slated roofs dashed with bright patches of brilliant golden lichen, rises into the pure blue sky the tall spire of the Cathedral, chased with geometric patterns, the pierced tracery of its pinnacles telling dark upon the silvery granite of which it is constructed. The lovely scene is enlivened by the white sails of innumerable small craft scudding across the harbour, by the tall spars and interlacing cordage of the vessels which lie at anchor in the offing, and, as we pass the pier head, by the bustle and movement of the crowd which throngs the quays, soldiers and *douaniers*, visitors from Paris in the latest *modes*, English tourists in all the eccentricities of costume assumed to be requisite for foreign travel, blue-bloused workmen, and white-coiffed townswomen. Then overhead rings out the *Angelus* from the Cathedral tower, and reminds us that, despite the Gambettas and the Ferrys and the Farres who are trampling on France in the sacred name of "Liberty," Catholicity has still her home on the soil of Brittany and in the hearts of her people.

Twelve centuries ago the same natural features of the scene, the eternal barriers of granite that form the coast line, the outflow of the lovely Rance, and the green trees which clothe the shore, presented themselves to the eyes of a fugitive from the honours and responsibilities of the Episcopate, St. Malo or Maclou. A Celtic priest of Welsh origin, his piety had pointed him out as one

well fitted to bear the pastoral staff, but his humility would not permit him to accept the proffered dignity, and he chose rather to risk the perils of the ocean than accept the responsibilities of the Episcopate. As the prow of his rude galley touched the narrow strand of the granite islet on which the town now stands, the fugitive found an unlooked-for welcome at the hands of a pious cenobite who had established himself with a few monks on the storm-swept rock. His name was Aaron, and after faithfully serving God for many years, he went to his rest A.D. 543, leaving his guest as his successor. His memory is preserved by a little chapel, which stands on what is said to be the site of his cell, and crowns the apex of the crag on which the city stands. Dedicated to the Most Blessed Virgin and St. Aaron, the existing oratory is not more ancient than A.D. 1620, having been consecrated on the 23rd of February of that year, Paul the Fifth being Pope, Louis the Thirteenth King of France, and William Bishop of St. Malo. Once installed as successor to his hospitable host, St. Malo set about to preach the Gospel to the Pagan inhabitants of the city of Aleth, which rose opposite to his rocky home, and at last, in despite of his renewed objections, was named bishop of that see. His life was one of toil for the propagation of Christianity, and illustrated by innumerable miracles. Driven from his see by a barbarous King, the son of Hoel the Great, he fled to Saintes, and there died in the full odour of sanctity. Years after, his relics were brought back, and a church having been erected on the rock on which he first found shelter, they were laid therein, and his name was given to both church and island. In 1144, after having existed for over five centuries in the old Celtic city, the episcopal see was transferred from Aleth to St. Malo de l'Île. Two churches had been built before the one still existing, and of this a portion erected on the occasion of the transfer of the see has come down to our day. The first construction was probably the simple monastic church of St. Aaron and his community, that was destroyed A.D. 811 by one of the officers of Charlemagne, but Bishop Hélocar appealed to the great Emperor to reinstate the ruin caused by his subordinate, and the second church, dedicated to St. Vincent of Saragossa, martyr, was built up on the old foundations. Bishop Jean de la Grille (1144) erected the third church, of which the arcades of the existing nave still remain, their capitals, charged with the characteristic foliage and grotesques of the early Romanesque

architecture, sufficiently attesting to their antiquity. The choir of the same period was replaced a century and a half later by the lofty and elegant construction of Bishop Jean de Limoëlan (1310), which still stands, with its tall lancet windows and its square eastern end, and its buttresses growing more lofty as the ground falls at their base. As for the remainder of the edifice, it belongs to much more recent dates. Round about the church grew up by degrees the city of St. Malo, clinging to the rugged surface of the mass of granite, its narrow streets rising and falling with the irregularities of the rocky foundation. A long and storm-swept tongue of sand, called Le Sillon, alone linked it to the mainland, the sea beat upon the foot of the island on every other side, and with the labyrinth of hidden rocks and treacherous shoals of which we have spoken formed its surest defence. As the town of St. Malo grew, the ancient Aleth diminished in importance. At one time the capital of the Curiosolites, the residence of a prefect and the seat of a military division during the latter years of the Empire, its Gallo-Roman walls (fragments of which still exist) to gird it from attack, and its secure harbour just within the mouth of the Rance, had given a considerable importance to the *vicus Alethum*. But the planting of the cross upon its Druidical altars by St. Malo, changed its destinies. It became, as we have said, a bishopric, and to this day a fragment of an early Romanesque church, called St. Pierre de la Cité, speaks of its ancient Christianity. More exposed to attack than the wave-washed rock on which the city of St. Malo had gradually been built, after its wooden dwellings had been twice burned by the rude Norman pirates, little by little the inhabitants of Aleth left their former home to seek a securer refuge on the rock of St. Malo. For a long series of years the latter city, under the government of its Bishops, a rule sanctioned by the Holy See and confirmed by the Dukes of Brittany, enjoyed perfect peace and entire neutrality, amidst the internecine wars of the thirteenth and of two-thirds of the fourteenth centuries. But with a wise prevision of possible troubles, the Malouins had raised round about their city, rooted in the crevices of their granite foundations, a formidable circuit of walls, with massive towers at the four corners of the irregular square which inclosed the city, four strongly fortified gates, and a lofty donjon keep guarding the land approach. For awhile, during the war of 1373, the soldiers of our Edward the Third held these fortifica-

tions, but in the evil days, when the light of victory had left the banner of the chivalrous Black Prince, the Malouins threw open their gates to Du Guesclin, and forced the English garrison and their leader, Sir Robert Knolles, to retire. Five years later, as soon almost as Richard the Second had mounted the English throne, the people of St. Malo, gathered on their bastions, saw upon the horizon the broad sails of a numerous fleet bearing the leopard banner, and the Duke of Lancaster disembarked a formidable army upon the coast. The outlying country was harried, and the tall galleys from La Rochelle which lay in the harbour laden with wine were given up to the flames. Then the Sillon was cut, mines were driven, and the donjon was breached, but the obstinate valour of the townspeople was too much for the besiegers. Du Guesclin again advanced to succour the besieged, and for the second time the English host drew off before the unconquered walls of St. Malo.

But if the Malouins were unwilling to accept the English as their masters, they were no more disposed to waive their birthright as Bretons and submit to the sceptre of France, and though Charles the Fifth would fain have taken possession of the fair duchy of Brittany, the Duke, John the Fourth, stood his ground, and maintained the independence of his State. Having done their duty loyally as subjects when the common weal was at stake, the people of St. Malo, led on by their Bishop, Josselin de Rohan, desired to claim their ancient independence of any ruler but the Roman Pontiff and his representative, their Bishop. A struggle ensued, resulting in the entrance of Duke John to St. Malo as suzerain of the city. He was met by the clergy in procession, and dismounted on the sea shore to kiss the cross and relics they bore out to meet him, and having granted pardon to the citizens, who knelt ungirded at his feet and prayed for forgiveness, he passed by the fallen drawbridge and beneath the open portcullis into the city. Their submission proved to be but of little sincerity. Three years passed, and in 1387 the Malouins, availing themselves of the temporary absence of the Duke's lieutenants, admitted the troops of the French King, who took possession of St. Malo in the name of Charles the Fourth. For twenty-eight years the fleur-de-lys waved over the sea-girt bastions of the city, and its defences were materially enlarged and strengthened. Pope Clement the Sixth, at the earnest supplication of the people, who dreaded the vengeance of their Duke should he again recover his revolted

city, granted St. Malo to the French crown, but Duke Jean was resolved to punish his fickle subjects, and in 1392 he once more blockaded the town by land and sea. For several months the siege was continued, and though two armies under the leadership of two skilled commanders closely beleaguered the valiant stronghold, it resisted successfully, and the besiegers were fain to retire, holding only the fortress of the Solidor which still looks down on the mouth of the Rance. A union between the royal house of France and the ducal Seigneurs of Brittany, in 1415, once more placed St. Malo in the keeping of the latter. Once more the inhabitants, headed by their Bishop and clergy, advanced beyond their city walls as suppliants for pardon, once more the Duke, John the Fifth, granted their prayer, and the ermined banner of Brittany was again hoisted to the sea breeze above its donjon. So, for seventy-three years the Dukes of Brittany held lordship and ward over the fortress and city of St. Malo. In 1488, when fresh troubles had arisen in France, and the young King, Charles the Eighth, was renewing the attempt to include Brittany within the boundaries of his State, the Sire de la Trémoille, Lieutenant of the King, appeared with a strong force upon the site of the ancient Aleth, and this time the destructive power of artillery was brought to bear on the hitherto impregnable walls of St. Malo. Batteries were constructed upon the beach exposed to the influx of the tides, but the cannon were so protected from the action of the water by being enveloped in hides soaked in grease and covered with pitch, that immediately on the ebb, volley after volley was discharged, and a capitulation soon ensued. In so unequal a conflict, for the first time the garrison laid down their weapons, and bearing white wands in place of their good swords, were allowed to leave the city. Soon afterwards Anne, Duchess of Brittany, became the wife of Charles the Eighth. Our Henry the Seventh, who was prepared to stand by Brittany in her evil fortune, withdrew his invading army from Calais and made peace with the French King, and St. Malo was given as a portion of her appanage to the Queen. In 1498, despite the opposition of Bishop Guillaume Briçonnet, who seems to have clung to the ancient ecclesiastical tenure of the city as overriding the regal authority, Anne caused a new and powerful fortification to be erected to command the Sillon and the chief entrance to the city. Two great towers linked together by a wedge-like out-work advance beyond the angle of the walls, one called La

Générale, and the other Quinquengrogne, in allusion to the complaints of the Bishop and decision of the Queen, which were commemorated by the inscription sculptured on the tower itself, by order of the latter—*Qui qu'en grogne, ainsi sera, c'est mon plaisir.*

In 1570, St. Malo was the scene of splendid pageants on the occasion of the visit of Charles the Ninth. In twenty barges, gaily adorned with scutcheons, fluttering pennons, and costly hangings, the authorities and notables of St. Malo sailed up the Rance on a May morning till they met the King half way, he having started by the river from Dinan. Amidst the roar of ordnance and the blare of trumpets, the monarch left his own galley to step into the leading barge of his subjects. A brilliant Court crowded round the King, and his mother, Catherine of Medici, and his brother, the Duke of Anjou, added to the importance and splendour of the occasion. So by the lovely scenery of the Rance, its bright waters reflecting the vivid colours of banner and costume, and the glint of polished armour, its tall cliffs and deep bays echoing to the clang of joyous music, the pageant swept down, past the grey tower of the Solidor and round the rugged base of La Cité, till the prows of the galleys touched the landing-place of St. Malo, where the inhabitants, grouped in companies, wearing gay scarves, the children forming a band of mimic archers, received their noble guests. The keys of the city were presented to the King, the Provost-Marshal made a loyal address—a duty not less cherished by municipal authorities in old times than in our own day, and probably not less tedious to the hearer then as now—and beneath a royal canopy, Charles passed into St. Malo amidst the ories of *Vive le Roi!* The following day, being the feast of Corpus Christi, was given up to religious exercises, and after Vespers the King sailed over to the Isle Cézembre. The day after was devoted to receiving the petitions of the citizens for various privileges, and the offering of costly presents, and was terminated by a mock sea-fight, and the next morning the King left for Dol. We have dwelt on this event, as for the remainder of its history the grim events of arms and strife are more conspicuous than the joyous acclamations of a loyal people and the pomp and circumstance of peaceful pageants.

The wars of religion had already dyed the fair land of France with blood. For a long period the Malouins adhered to a neutral policy between the conflicting parties, till, on the

occasion of the murder of Henry the Third, an attempt was made by the Governor, the Count de Fontaines, to acknowledge the then Protestant King, Henry the Fourth. Fidelity to their faith induced the inhabitants of St. Malo to revolt against this proposal, but meanwhile the martial monarch of Navarre was carrying all before him in the Orléanais, Maine, and Normandy, and it became a matter of life and death for them to take some decisive step. Their Governor, as we have said, was a partisan of Henry the Fourth, and by a strange logic, the Malouins arrived at the conclusion, that if he was got rid of, their homes would be safe from danger. They resolved to be wholly free from external rule, and with the sturdy independence of hardy mariners accustomed to struggle with adverse powers, and to depend on their strong arms and God alone, they determined on exterminating the garrison of their city, casting off their allegiance, and proclaiming a Republic. A chosen group of citizens held long and secret council, and at last on March 11, 1590, fifty-five daring men, armed to the teeth, contrived by the aid of two of the garrison of the castle, who had been bought over, to scale the tower La Générale. Startled from their sleep by the cries of the storming party the garrison rushed to arms, whilst from the town below arose the din of wild shouts, shots were fired at hap-hazard against the donjon walls, and the church bells clanged out into the night. Bewildered by the darkness, and exaggerating the number of assailants, the garrison was soon overwhelmed, the Governor was struck down by a stray shot, and the arms, furniture, plate, and treasure were sacked by the townsfolk who poured into the fallen fortress. Not content with this success, and fearing a renewal of his pretensions to temporal authority, the Malouins next laid hands on their Bishop, thrust him into prison, and for four years held their city, following their own self-imposed laws. Eventually, on Henry the Fourth making his solemn abjuration of Protestantism, in 1594, they sought for reconciliation with the Crown, and the King generously granted them letters patent to efface all memories of their rebellion.

Early in the seventeenth century an event of special interest to English Catholics occurred in St. Malo. William Gifford, his mother a Throckmorton, quondam student of Lincoln College, Oxford, afterwards of the University of Louvain, under "Father" Robert Bellarmine, later the friend and theologian of St. Charles Borromeo, and Dean of Lille, became in 1608 a

Benedictine monk. Having rebuilt the monastery of Dieulwart, where he received the habit and the name in religion of Gabriel of St. Mary, he resolved, with the approbation of his superiors, to found a new house of English Benedictines at St. Malo. Accordingly, in January, 1611, whilst "the wisest fool in Europe" was hanging Catholic clergy and laity at home, Father Gifford and Father Barnes reached St. Malo. With the largest expression of true charity the two religious were received with open arms by the Bishop, who bestowed a prebend on Father Gifford, in order that the endowment might afford support for the religious. A generous citizen named Toutin gave them a house and chapel, and engaged to supply them with an annual allowance of corn. Six monks reached St. Malo later in the same year, and Father Gifford was elected Prior, the Bishop, in addition to his other favours, assigning to him a chair of divinity. In 1617 Father Gifford was appointed the first "President" of the newly instituted English Benedictines. He did not hold this position long, being consecrated Bishop of Archidai, and at the age of fifty-eight was elected coadjutor to Cardinal Lewis of Lorraine, Archbishop of Rheims. In 1622 he succeeded to the archiepiscopal throne of Rheims, with the title and rank of premier peer of France. His "great master," St. Charles of Milan, was ever his model. Honours and dignities never diminished his assiduity to his duties nor his devotion to the poor, and on April 11, 1629, this remarkable man gave up his soul to God. We may be well assured he did not lose sight of his foundation at St. Malo. It grew and flourished. A church was erected hard by the chapel of St. Aaron, and may still be seen, though desecrated to the purposes of the *Régie des Tabacs* of the French Republic. Two fine marble statues of St. Benedict and St. Maurus, formerly in this church, are now in the Cathedral, having been happily saved from destruction. After an existence of fifty years, the jealousy of the Parliament of Brittany, and the fact of the incessant conflicts not only between France and England, but between St. Malo itself and the English fleets, rendered it impossible for the community to remain, and in 1661 they were compelled to break up their establishment, disposing of their property with much difficulty. In a contemporary view of St. Malo in the *Topographia Galliae* of Martin Zeiller (1655—61), the tower, no longer existing, of the English Benedictine Church is a conspicuous feature, grouping with the exaggerated mass of the Cathedral and the

slim spirelet of the original chapel of St. Aaron. The Church of St. Sauveur, still attached to the hospital founded in 1252, is also conspicuous, and the spire of another church, probably Notre Dame des Anges, now destroyed. With the exception of a narrow quay to the port, the sea is shown as washing the feet of the city walls, a massive machicolated tower rises in the centre of the city, and in the foreground is the imposing Church of St. Servan—since replaced by the ungainly structure now existing—and a few dwellings, where in our day stands the large and pleasant town, with its gardens and open places.

During the long struggle in the seventeenth century for naval supremacy between England and France, the Malouins had acquired a reputation only too well earned for their daring courage at sea, and had proved a thorn in the side of the English merchant fleet. At last it was resolved to purge the seas of this pestilent nest of hornets, and with the laurels of the splendid naval conflict of La Hogue still green, an English fleet, composed of ten ships of the line and five mortar boats, anchored in the offing of St. Malo (November 26, 1693), and for four consecutive days shelled the city. On the fourth night a fireship ninety feet long, packed with powder, shell, grenades, shot, and fragments of broken iron, was steered directly for the town. Happily for St. Malo, a sudden gust of wind diverted it from its course, and it ran aground on one of the innumerable rocks in the roadstead. It was within range of the Fort Royal, and the heavy fire of the fort, and the hopelessness of getting afloat, led to the crew deserting their dangerous post, and as they left setting fire to the slow matches. Unhappily, these were inaccurately calculated. Before the engineer, who had constructed this infernal machine, and who was the last to leave it, could set foot in the boat, which, with a crew of forty men, was to remove them out of reach of danger, the explosion took place, and all perished. The awful violence of the eruption showed the Malouins what a providential escape they and their city had had. The whole city trembled, chimneys fell, windows were shivered, and the shock was felt even at a distance of two leagues. As the tide ebbed, three hundred shells, and three hundred barrels charged with powder, shot, and pieces of iron, were left upon the beach. The failure of the enterprize was too evident, and three days later the English fleet raised anchor and steered northwards, to the immense relief of the inhabitants of St. Malo, as we may well believe. The unsuccess

of this attack led, two years later, to the reappearance of the English fleet, this time in combination with that of Holland. For four days a fierce and continuous fire was kept up upon both city and forts. They on their side answered with undaunted pertinacity, and after an ineffectual attempt to burn the city, the united fleets once more drew off, leaving the gallant fortress unharmed. Encouraged by this result of their courage and daring, the Malouins devoted themselves more than ever to the dubiously moral, but highly profitable, profession of privateering. Lying in wait behind the impregnable natural barriers of their rocky girdle, they dashed out in pursuit of every ship that ill fortune guided near their lair. No less than one thousand five hundred vessels, several of them charged with the riches of newly discovered continents, fell into their hands in a single campaign. It is not to be wondered at that the inhabitants waxed rich. In 1711, when Louis the Fourteenth, by his constant wars, was compelled to appeal to the generosity of his subjects for help, the Malouins lent no less a sum than thirty millions of francs to the royal treasury, but it is fair to say that legitimate enterprize had produced much of this wealth, for the vessels of St. Malo were engaged in active trade with the Indies and Peru. Once more, in 1758, when a war had again broken out which was to ravage Europe for seven years, and whilst the armies of George the Second and Louis the Fifteenth were struggling for the possession of Canada, a new descent upon St. Malo was made by England, with an army of fifteen thousand troops, whilst a fleet of one hundred vessels anchored off Cancale. A terrible destruction of French vessels in the port of St. Malo, both of men-of-war and merchantmen, was the result. Between the 12th and 13th of June a loss amounting to fifteen millions of francs was thus inflicted by the invading force, but the city itself did not yield, and the assailants withdrew. In the same year, only three months later, a new expedition landed to the west of St. Malo at St. Cast, but a resolute and successful opposition was made to the disembarkment, and since that date the English flag has never again been seen under a hostile aspect before the unconquered walls of St. Malo.

The first mutterings of the awful tempest of Revolution which was to sweep over France with the direst havoc and ruin, were beginning to be heard, and already the demon of violent change and disorder was abroad. Under these disturbing influences, St. Servan, in 1789, cast off its allegiance to the

mother city, and established itself as a detached commune, with a separate municipality and a town guard of its own. It had shared the fortunes, and profited by the successes, of the more ancient city, and now sought its independent existence. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, when the limited space of St. Malo, closely hemmed round by its fortifications, forbade further extension, various religious establishments were founded in St. Servan — the diocesan seminary, now a barrack, the Hôpital du Rosais, a convent of Capuchins, &c., whilst several of the merchant princes of St. Malo established themselves in the open environs of this pleasant suburb. To this day there still exists the bitterest jealousy and disunion between the two towns springing from this act of independence of St. Servan.

Unhappily for St. Malo, its inhabitants were at an early date bitten by the *tarantella* of the Revolution. In 1790, when the *régime* of "decrees," imitated by the Jacobins of 1880, had come into force, and convents were closed and religious expelled, the Malouins thought fit to get rid of their Bishop, Mgr. Cortois de Pressigny, and accepted in his place the paternal rule of "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity." We have examples of the practice of this *régime* enacted under our eyes in the year of grace 1881. They differ from the incidents of a century ago by their profound hypocrisy, not a characteristic of the "Great" Revolution, which was frank to a degree. In October, 1791, the enlightened citizens of St. Malo indulged in a favourite amusement of the *citoyens* of our day, by defacing the ancient armorial bearings of the city wherever sculptured, utterly indifferent to the fact of these arms being the symbol of the valour, the prudence, the fidelity, and the patriotism of previous generations. At the commencement of the following year, 1792, the revolutionary Government at Paris "requisitioned" all the city artillery. Three ancient culverins given by Dugay Trouin, and twenty-four guns the gift of Mgr. Louis Alexandre, Count of Toulouse, Grand Admiral of France and Governor of Brittany in 1696, was carried off or melted down. In August of the same year, after adhering by solemn oath to the decrees pronouncing the fall of royalty, the revolutionary administration took possession of the Church plate and bells, and both went to the melting-pot, excepting one ancient bell given in the far old times to the Church of St. Vincent by Bishop Hélocar. In October the guillotine was set up *en permanence*, and in November, the

inscription of Anne of Brittany, which we quoted as being inscribed on the tower of Quinquengrogne, was industriously defaced. It was only due to the revolutionary zeal of the Malouins that they should enjoy the visit of one of the leaders of the party, and in April of 1793 the sanguinary Billaud Varennes favoured them with his presence. Six thousand three hundred and thirty men of St. Malo and its environs were serving under the flag of the Republic, but that was not enough, a further contingent of six hundred and fifty men was demanded by the Conventionist, and still further to commemorate his visit, the portcullis of the keep was destroyed, and the elegant belfry or clock-tower of the Grande Porte was swept away. Twelve loyal inhabitants of St. Malo died on the scaffold in the June of this year, and another monster in human shape, Carrier, reached St. Malo to urge forward the bloody progress of the Revolution. Arrests without number took place, and Barrère's proposal, *de placer la terreur à l'ordre du jour*, was carried out to the letter. The appointment of Citizen Lecarpentier as representative of the Convention at St. Malo was the next step. St. Malo had merited well this honour, and that ferocious and brutal monster fully appreciated the "duties" of his position. *Le tigre et le singe* were intimately combined in his personality, though this monstrous combination was not unusual in Republican France in 1793, as we saw it revive under the Commune of 1871, and as we may yet see it crawl into existence once more under certain contingencies, if we may judge by the ravings which reach our ears from certain groups of free and fraternal electors of the *peuple souverain*.

Lecarpentier arrived escorted by all the scourges and the crimes that can possibly afflict mankind. Armed with the barbarous authority of the Convention, and strong in his own wickedness, he inflicted every imaginable misery upon the unfortunate inhabitants of St. Malo, both as regards their properties and their lives. Aided by a secret committee formed of the dregs of society, five hundred unfortunate persons were cast into prison, and one hundred and twenty perished on the scaffold, whilst even the dead were exhumed, and the lead of their coffins was rifled with the double object of procuring ammunition *pour combattre nos ennemis et détruire les restes de l'orgueil de la féodalité*. The goddess of reason was set up, *un sermon analogue à la fête et la circonstance* was delivered, and this truly patriotic festival ended by a

bonfire of documents, manuscripts, and feudal title-deeds, which lay in the archive chambers of the Hotel de Ville. It is useless to continue this dismal story. A terrible famine desolated the country, while Lecarpentier was occupied in the work of destruction, in organizing new *fêtes*, and in administering "Republican baptism." The value of property violently seized by the committee, or "voluntarily" given, reached on June 26, 1794, to the enormous sum of 533,950 livres, but it had all gone into the gulf, and in the urgent necessity of finding yet more means for the devouring Republic, every atom of lead from gutters and roofs, every fragment of iron, no matter how artistic, from balconies, stair-rails, grilles, &c., were torn down, sold or melted, and even the very bell-ropes had to be laid at the feet of the destroyer to avoid *désagréments* in case of non-compliance.

At last the tide turned, and though the fall of Robespierre was known in St. Malo on August 1, five days after it had occurred, the demons of the Revolution clutched at their power to the last, and on the 3rd gave up to the flames a fresh hecatomb of historic documents, chiefly belonging to the chapter of the Cathedral, and on the 6th beheaded a venerable priest, Père Oyer, and an aged lady, Mademoiselle Glatin, the last victims of the reign of liberty, equality, and fraternity!

The worst of the storm had passed, but St. Malo was ruined. Not a ship in its port, an utter want of the necessities of life. No firewood, and such a penury of glass, that the windows were protected by paper. Add to this, a winter of such exceptional rigour that the banks of the Rance were covered with dead frozen fish. In July, 1795, St. Malo, with a slender garrison of a hundred and twenty artillerymen, was as nearly as possible falling into the hands of the Royalist party. Encouraged by the presence of an English fleet off the coast, the Vendéans and Bretons of the Catholic army had planned a surprise, but the plot was defeated by the Governor, who promptly collected additional troops and ammunition. Gradually, as time went on, the faithful clergy showed themselves again, and the people crowded round the altars that were once more set up, though not yet without danger. The Sisters of St. Thomas of Villanova presented themselves at the devastated hospital, and, though in absolute want of every requisite, devoted themselves once more to their mission of charity. With these signs of better times, the old passion of plunder on the high seas revived in St. Malo. In 1796, despite the poverty of the citizens, they managed to construct five

privateers, and before the close of 1797 no less than thirty of these "water-rats" swept the seas, having as their leader the famous corsair, Robert Sourcouf. England, Holland, Spain, and Portugal, all suffered from this brigandage, and it was not till early in the present century that it was finally suppressed. From that period the energy of the Malouins has been turned to more moral, if less productive, sources of industry, and to more legitimate opportunities of displaying their intrepid seaman-ship. It has been calculated that the net profits of twenty-nine corsairs, in one year, from June, 1807, to the same month in 1808, amounted to no less a sum than 2,075,332 francs.

The fall of Napoleon, the return of the ancient race of the Kings of France, the hundred days, the presence of the allied forces, only distantly affected St. Malo. In February, 1817, the expelled Bishop, Mgr. de Pressigny, not forgetful of his ancient see, bestowed upon the Cathedral of St. Malo the relics of St. Célestine, given to him by Pius the Seventh—thus establishing a link between past and present times across the gulf of the Revolution.

To our own day, a legitimate pride in the ancient independence and valour of her sons, and the number of eminent men she has produced, still animates the citizens of St. Malo. Jacques Cartier, the discoverer of Canada; the famous sea-captain, Duguay Trouin; the learned geometrician, Moreau de Maupertuis; Admiral Thévenard, Minister of the Marine; Chateaubriand and Lamennais, and many other illustrious names in the roll-call of science, literature, and arms, adorn the records of St. Malo, once a desolate storm-beaten rock, the solitary home of the monk Aaron.

GEORGE GOLDIE.

and twenty, and by the presence of an English fleet off the coast, the Vendéens and Bretons of the Catholic army had planned a surprise, but the plot was detected by the Governor who promptly collected additional troops and ammunition. Gradually, as time went on, the faithful clergy showed themselves again, and the people crowded round the altars that were once more set up, though not yet without danger. The Sisters of St. Thomas of Villanova presented themselves at the devastated hospital, and, though in absolute want of every requisite, devoted themselves once more to their mission of charity. With these signs of better times the old mission of St. Malo, on the high seas revived in St. Malo. In 1793, despite the poverty of the citizens, they managed to construct five

Chronicles of The Stage.

CHAPTER XI.

PLAYHOUSE LIFE.

AS this contest between the two theatres continues, it will be interesting to consider some incidents of the inner theatrical life of the times. How, for instance, did the authors fare? An amusing account is given of the mode a new play was offered, accepted, and brought out. "A gentleman," says the narrator, "carried a play to Drury Lane. A day was appointed for the reading." A dinner was accordingly ordered at a tavern, to which half the number of the players came—as it seems each was to pay his share of the score.

In the reading of it (that is, after dinner) most of them dropped off, but two remained to hear it out, and then they walked; so that there was but the gentleman and his friend left, and not a penny all this while paid towards the reckoning. The play was ordered to be licensed, so that forty shillings for the dinner, and forty more for the licence, made just £4, so much it cost him already. This happened to be in Lent, and the players having then the first day of a play given them, this was bespoke; so the author had the mortification of having it acted in Lent. But the devil on't was, he was obliged to treat every one of his players all the while it was in rehearsal, to keep them in study, and in that exploit it cost him in coach hire and wine near £10.

Crit. The devil it did. *Sull.* 'Tis certainly true. Well, his third day came, and a good appearance there was. I sat in the pit, and I think I never saw better boxes. The play came off pretty well, and the poet was much exalted with so good an escape, for it was his first. His friends joyed him when it was over, and he thought he had now the Indies to receive. Pay-day came, and what do you think he received?

Crit. Had he only a third night? *Sull.* No more; it lasted but four.

Crit. I suppose he paid the charges? *Sull.* That you may swear.

Crit. Then he might receive—— The house was full you say?

Sull. Excellent pit and boxes, and, I believe, full above. *Crit.* Why then, he might receive £70; nay, I diminish it as much as I can,

because I know their way of bringing in their bills of charges. *Sull.* He received but £15. *Crit.* How could that be? The ordinary charge is about £34 a day. *Sull.* But the extraordinary (when they please to make it so) is very extraordinary, without any compass. They brought him bills for gloves, for chocolate, for snuff; this singer begged a guinea, that dancer the same; one actor wished him joy, and asked how he liked his performance: "Oh, very well, Mr. —. I ought to gratify—" Another cries, "Oh dear, Mr. —, I never took so much pains in my life; that deserves a kiss and a present:" and the next morning away flies another guinea. *Crit.* By this account you make him a loser.

It would thus seem that it was almost open to any one to furnish a play; and indeed, with the players so dependent on the Court and courtiers, it is natural that the fine gentleman of the day should use the chance which such dependence offered to him.

I believe [says a lively writer] it often happens that an old or a young poet takes pen, ink, and paper, sits down to his scrutoire, or perhaps a table. He finds it necessary to write a play. He turns over God knows how many volumes for a story, or he makes one, and then—he writes a play. The dispute is, must it be a tragedy or comedy? The arguments of both sides are weighty. It cannot be decided, the reasons are so equal. At last he wisely counts his buttons, or trusts to cross and pile. As fortune would have it, Tragedy wins the day. You see in the play-bill and title-page, TRAGEDY, in large red letters, like a saint in the calendar.

And again of the managers:

They do not consider a play as to its merit, the reputation it would bring to their art, or the pleasure or instruction it would give the town, but, what expenses must we be at to fit it for the stage? what time must we lose to study the parts? and what money will it bring in to answer our pains and expenses? We may proceed with those stock plays we are perfect in, or revive those which have lain dormant half an age; they'll be new to the town, and save us the trouble of getting by rote more parts than we can remember, and anticipate the charge of clothes, scenes, and the poet's third night. Thus argue laziness, ignorance, and avarice. This is the care they take of encouraging poetry and obliging the town. Their behaviour is recent in every memory, when both companies were united under their banner. The spectators, poets, and actors of those days can but in death forget it. We seldom then had an opera to entertain us, and our music was in a tolerably bad way. Plays we had none but what and when they pleased to give us one. So even our men of sense and ladies of fashion were

forced to run for amusement to the puppet-show and bear-garden. Either the underling actors were dignified with the principal characters, or, if the heads condescended to visit the town, they but trifled, yawned, and slept three hours away. They grudged the smallest expense to invite or amuse company. They were sensible they had no other house to go to. A new scene or suit of clothes, a new dance or piece of music, were as rare as a comet, and when they blazed forth the prices were raised, and the town paid the piper. Thus they enriched themselves, starved their players, and fooled our nobility and gentry. Since the establishment of the two theatres our usage has been kinder and their behaviour modester, and it is absolutely proper that two houses should always subsist, not that wit thrives better than before, they affecting only to encourage the heel, and not the head.

The next error in management of the masters of our playhouses is visible in a wrong disposition or choice of proper actors for the stage. Here are a company of players entered as the King's servants who (as Hamlet has it) are fit either for tragedy, comedy, history, pastoral, pastoral-comical, historical-pastoral, tragical-historical. This set of gentlemen and ladies are to go through all plays and all characters in as many different shapes as the world and theatre can vary them. The same man must one day keep justly up to the grandeur of a monarch, the next personate as exactly the miserable beggar; now a tyrant defying the gods and breathing destruction to mankind, anon a whining lover expiring for a frown. In one play he must put on the ridiculous fop, in another a slovenly justice of peace, or courtier, or cit, or statesman, or captain of the militia, just as his lot is that evening. The women too must pass through the same variety of characters. The romping country hoyden to-night must shine out the fine lady of the play to-morrow; one day as starched as a formal city matron, the next as flippant as a Court coquette. In tragedy a proud ambitious queen dwindles in comedy to a pert, jilting chambermaid.

As for those humorous dances exhibited at Drury Lane, I have not yet discovered whether they are designed as a burlesque upon the other house or themselves. But as their mimics are arrived at the *ne plus ultra* of badness in that way, if they cannot improve, I think it is high time they should leave off, since they cannot do worse. I must observe one thing though in their favour, which is, that their designs answer more to the spirit of the old mimics, they keeping up entirely to the life and beauty of action, however lame in the execution, not clogging their entertainments with those monstrous loads of harmonious rubbish we are tired with at the other house.

Of the behaviour of the audience :

They are generally so very impatient to gain the centre of the pit or the first row of the gallery, that they hurry from dinner with spouse under one arm and the remnants of an unfinished meal in a coloured

handkerchief under the other. As the plot of the play begins to thicken their appetites grow sharp, having not been sufficiently stuffed at noon. Then their greatest concern is how they may be satisfied with decency and decorum, that no curious neighbour may discover their treasure and long for a morsel. Thus restrained by the orderly management of their portable larder, it is impossible for them to have any regard to the business of the stage. But by that time the poet begins to unravel his design by an artful catastrophe, which strikes an attentive silence upon the sensible part of the audience. Their natural cloak-bags are filled for a journey; they stretch, and cry, "Lord! when will these tiresome people have done? I wish we had a dance, and were a-bed."

It will thus be seen there were no "Refreshment Bars" in these days. Next for the audience. Lady Plyant and Beau Modish thus discourse:

B. Mod. I suppose your ladyship honoured the new opera with your presence? *L. Ply.* Certainly, Mr. Modish. I never miss the first night. *B. Mod.* Was your ladyship mightily pleased? *L. Ply.* I cannot say; but so-so tolerable enough, what I minded of the thing; but I shall not declare myself till its character is established by the town. *B. Mod.* Was it approved of by that audience? *L. Ply.* Some strange creatures seemed in raptures. The claps came from the gallery, but few admirers below stairs, and those mighty ill-dressed. *B. Mod.* Then it must be d——d stuff. There is nothing, sure, in life so impertinent as critics of either sex in Long Lane or Monmouth Street suits. The pretend to judge of fashions in poetry or music, and cannot put on their own clothes—preposterous! *L. Ply.* Most absurd and ridiculous. *B. Mod.* Demme, if I have not heard an awkward thing in pattens and a draggle-tailed calico cry Fogh! at the prettiest and softest air in the world, and a rough-hewn transoutane fellow call the genteelst, smoothest verse imaginable, insipid nonsense, who never wore a pair of clean gloves in his life, shaved but once a month, and scarce knew a barber's shop from a chocolate house, or a coach from a wheelbarrow. *L. Ply.* Intolerable! For my part, I would, no more applaud what is censured by the well-bred, well-dressed world, than walk to Court in a ruff and fardingale, repeating some lines of Chaucer. *B. Mod.* I am entirely of your ladyship's mind. A singularity of judgment is mighty foolish. One looks as silly as a dog on the stage. The whole house hoots, and the poor creature knows not which way to run.

I met one of these judging gentlemen after a new play at the coffee house, so asked Sir Wm. how he liked the new play? Extremely well, sir; a mighty full house. Did Mrs. Ol—ld's part become her? I never saw her look with better red and white in my life. W—ks they say appeared to great advantage in his. Certainly the prettiest fancied suit of clothes he ever wore! Was not M—lls prodigiously clapped? He

spoke some fine things, and I must own the cock of his hat and dangle of his cane were not amiss. But C——r is sure the comicallest impudentest dog that ever was born.

And certainly the state of the stage and the profaneness and indecency of the players seemed at this time to be running riot, and challenged the interference of all proper persons. Vigorous efforts were made to restrain and chastise them in "A Refutation of the Apology for the Actors," published in the *Camden Miscellany* (1703):

And here the English poets and players are still like themselves: they strain to a singularity of coarseness. The modern theatres of Europe are mere vestals to them. . . . To flash a little upon the imagination, and appear in the twilight, is not mischief enough. No, they love to have their sense clear and determined. They labour for perspicuity, and shine out in mire and in scandal. They were indeed found incorrigible. Their ill plays have been some of them examined; their licentious extravagance marked, and repeated instances produced upon them. . . . The players have met with faster instruction. The saws have been let loose upon them. They have been disciplined at Westminster Hall. They are proof against reason and punishment, against fines' argument, and come over again with the old smut and profanity.

In a piece published in 1704, called *A Refutation of the Impiety and Immorality of the Stage*, it was stated that "her Majesty had never once given any countenance to the play-houses by her royal presence." It added that in 1699 many players had actually been indicted in the courts.

Her Majesty having been pleased to issue her royal commands for a better regulation of the theatres, a copy thereof is as follows:

"Whereas we have already given orders to both companies nothing shall be acted contrary to religion or good manners upon pain of our high displeasure, and of being silenced from further acting; and being further desirous to reform all other indecencies and abuses of the stage, which have occasioned great disorders and justly give offence—our will and pleasure is, and we do hereby strictly command, that no person of what quality soever presume to go behind the scenes, or come upon the stage either before or during the acting of any play—that no woman be allowed or presume to wear a vizard mask in either of the theatres—and that no person come into the house without paying the price established for the respective places—all which orders we strictly command all the managers, sharers, and actors of the said companies to see exactly observed and obeyed; and we require and command all

our constables, and others appointed to attend the theatres, to be aiding and assisting to them therein; and if any person whatever shall disobey this our known pleasure and command, we shall proceed against them as contemnors of our royal authority and disturbers of the public peace. Given at our Court of St. James, 17th day of January, 24th of our reign."¹

Some of the incidents in the theatrical life of this time are significant. Thus, when Mr. Pinkethman took his benefit in September, 1702—he had before played "harlequin without a mask"—a notice was issued to the effect that "all persons that come behind the scenes are desired to pay their money to none *but him*." At another benefit: "None to go into the boxes or pit but with the subscriber's tickets, but the galleries and the boxes on the stage are for the benefit of the house." And again at a concert: "The boxes will be opened into the pit, into which none will be admitted without printed tickets, not exceeding four hundred at 5s. each. No money to be returned after the curtain is drawn."

CHAPTER XII.

RIVAL HOUSES.

THE company at Drury Lane in the season of 1702-3 consisted of the following:

Mr. Baggs, Mr. Bullock, Mr. Bowen, Mr. Bowman, Mr. Fairbank, Mr. Cibber, Capt. Griffin, Mr. Husband, Mr. Hall, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Leveridge, Mr. Mills, Mr. Norris, Mr. Newman, Mr. Pinkethman, Mr. Swiney, Mr. Wilks.

Mrs. Bicknell, Mrs. Campion, Signora Gasperini, Mrs. Kent, Mrs. Lucas, Mrs. Moore, Mrs. Rogers, Mrs. Shaw, Mrs. Verbenggen.

Singers.—Mr. Leveridge, Mrs. Shaw, Mr. and Mrs. Lindsay, Signorina Lindheim, Signorina Joanna Maria, Mrs. Campion, Mr. Pate, Mr. Hughes.

Instrumentalists.—M. Paisible, M. Gasparini, M. Luigione.

Dancers.—Mr. Cotton, Mrs. Bicknell, M. la Ferry, Devonshire girls, M. du Ruel, Mrs. Claxton, Mdle. St. Leger.

The great Horse Vaulting by Mr. Evans.

A new opposition theatre had now been planned in the Haymarket, for the performance of opera and entertainments. The plan was distinctly favoured by the Court, and the Chamberlain

¹ *Daily Courant*, January 24, 1704.

held out every promise of encouragement in hostility to the old patents. This step was actually taken in 1705, when thirty "persons of quality" subscribed £100 each, in return for which each was to have a "life admission." This scheme was promoted by Sir John "Vanbrugge" and Mr. Congreve, and really suggests a modern attempt whose unfinished relics may be seen on the Thames Embankment. One of the objects aimed at was to give Italian operas, a taste for which was then arising. The house was magnificent, as might be expected from the designer of Blenheim Palace, and was described as "a vast triumphal piece of architecture," which from the pictures seems like the works of the architect to "lay a heavy load on the earth." There were great columns, "gilded cornices, an immoderate high roof. At the first opening it, the flat ceiling that is now over the orchestra was then a semi-oval arch, that sprung fifteen feet higher from above the cornice. The ceiling over the pit, too, was still more raised, being one level line from the highest back part of the upper gallery to the front of the stage. The front boxes were a continued semicircle, to the bare walls of the house on each side. This extraordinary and superfluous space occasioned such an undulation from the voice of every actor, that generally what they said sounded like the gabbling of so many people in the lofty aisles of a cathedral." These were serious objections, and the whole had to be altered and contracted. It was also out of the beaten track. The city, Inns of Court, and "the middle host of the town," where the supporters of the drama lived, were too remote, out of reach of a walk.

Betterton and his friends obtained a licence, having dissolved union with the other house. Rich looked on with a curious indifference, no doubt believing that the scheme would fail. As a writer in that oddly named journal, *The Post-boy robb'd of his Mail*, says, there were certain reasons for prognosticating failure—its being built at the fag-end of the town, whither audiences could not resort without "an insupportable expense." Then the theatre was in itself "nothing better than what we had before except in the front." Next, there was the non-employment of the players of Drury Lane, who kept out of articles a long time, in expectation of being sent to. But Rich, either through pride, negligence, or something worse, never heeded till they were all engaged, and then without any manner of justice forced away one of them, when he might fairly, and without noise, have had

the major part and the best. Rich himself declared that the Court was against him, for he says that "I did humbly offer to his lordship (the Chamberlain) that I would receive the company at Lincoln's Inn Fields at such salaries as his lordship would think reasonable." What a strain of lowly submission is here! But his lordship was pleased to declare that her Majesty would have two companies. The pleasant writer of comedies, Mr. Cibber, who imparts a flavour of comedy to all that he describes, gives us a picture of Rich, behind the scenes at Drury Lane, where he called on him to learn his views. For, as he said with much justness, "there would always some sort of merit remain with fidelity, though unsuccessful." Suggesting that the Drury Lane corps was sadly thinned, he asked his master "in what manner he intended to proceed? He replied, 'Don't you trouble yourself; come along, and I'll show you.' He then led me about all the by-places in the house, and showed me fifty little back-doors, dark closets, and narrow passages, in alterations and contrivances of which kind he had busied his head most part of the vacation, for he was scarce ever without some notable joiner or a bricklayer extraordinary in pay for twenty years. And there are so many odd obscure places about a theatre, that his genius in nook-building was never out of employment, nor could the most vain-headed author be more deaf to an interruption in reciting his works than our wise master was while entertaining me with the improvements he had made in his invisible architecture, all which, though without thinking any one part of it necessary, I seemed to approve. I could not help now and then breaking in upon his delight with the impertinent question of, 'But, master, where are your actors?'"

The Haymarket venture, however, prospered for a time. The reason, perhaps, was the marked and open favour of the Court. No doubt it was this feeling that made Rich so complaisant, as he knew he could not contend against such influence. Their scheme of desertion was all arranged and put in execution within a week. "And what induced the Court to encourage it was, that by having the theatre and its manager more immediately dependent on the power of the Lord Chamberlain, it was not doubted, but the stage would be recovered into such a reputation as might now do honour to that absolute command which the Court or its officers seemed always fond of having over it." But we shall see more of this developed in a very

remarkable way. Rich, too, had other designs of entertainment. He wished to exhibit shows, singers, rope dancers, and other fantastic elements: "for it seems he had not purchased his share of the patent to mend the stage, but to make money of it. And to say truth, the opinion and money of the crowd weighed with him full as much as that of the best judges. His point was to please the majority, who could more easily comprehend anything they saw than the daintiest things that could be said to them"—a policy, indeed, not unknown to most modern managers. Some years before he was eager to engage an extraordinary large elephant, but was only dissuaded by his bricklayers assuring him that the opening necessarily to be made in the wall for the entry of the beast, would endanger the structure.

Under the puissant protection of the Court the new theatre opened, and, as the pleasant prompter Downes informs us, the first stone was laid by the beautiful Lady Sunderland, described as "the little Whig," and a plate of silver to record the ceremony was placed below it.¹

"About the end of 1704," says "old Downes," taking up the story, "Mr. Betterton assigned his licence and his whole company over to Captain Vanbrugge, to act under him at the theatre in the Haymarket, and upon April 9, 1705, Captain Vanbrugge opened his new theatre in the Haymarket with a foreign opera performed by a new set of singers arrived from Italy (the worst that ever came from thence), for it lasted but five days; and they being liked but indifferently by the gentry, they in a little time marched back to their own country. The first play acted there was *The Gamester*. . . . Then half a score of the old plays, acted in old clothes the company brought from Lincoln's Inn Fields. . . . The audiences falling off extremely with entertaining the gentry with such old ware, whereas had they opened the house at first with a good new English opera, or a new play, they would have preserved the favour of Court and city, and gained reputation and profit to themselves. Then was acted a new comedy, called *The Confederacy*, written by Captain Vanbrugge, an excellent witty play, and all parts very well acted; but the nice critic's censure, that it wanted just decorum, made it flag at last. Then a new opera, called

¹ On the other hand, it is stated that on March 19, 1825, removing some portion of the wall of the Italian Opera House, the workmen discovered the first stone of the old building, with some coins and an inscription—"April 18, 1704. This corner-stone of the Queen's Theatre was laid by his Grace, Charles Duke of Somerset."

The British Enchantress, which infinitely arried both sexes and pleased the town."

This new and worthy enterprise, however, did not flourish. One of her Majesty's players at Drury Lane, writing to a stroller at Nottingham, says: "Our stage is in a very indifferent condition. There has been a very fierce combat between the Haymarket and Drury Lane, and the two sisters, Music and Poetry, quarrel like two fishwives at Billingsgate: and then comes a whole battalion of subscribers, who promise to stand by the former. Though Farquahar meets with success, and has the entire happiness of pleasing the upper gallery, Betterton and Wilks, Ben Johnson and the best of them, must give place to a bawling Italian woman, whose voice to me is less pleasing than merry-andrew's playing on the gridiron. *The Mourning Bride*, *Plain Dealer*, *Volpone*, or *Tamerlane*, will hardly fetch us a tolerable audience, unless we stuff the bills with long entertainments of dances, songs, scaramouched entries, and what not." In this state of things, the enterprise clearly hurrying to disaster, the Chamberlain intervened, and with a capricious harshness that seems truly unjust, began to put pressure on Mr. Rich, that he should unite his flourishing concern with the failing institution of the Haymarket. This was done at the instigation of "Mr. Vanbrugge," whose miscarriage was owing to a series of blunders and bad management. After being advised all through by persons "who had before ruined two companies," he now was ready to break faith with the persons who had furnished the moneys for opposing the patentees, and was ready to unite with these latter. It was justly said that this was an attempt to destroy the patent and unite the companies when he found his hopes and projects disappointed, contrary to the pleasure and wish of his benefactors, who gave him their subscriptions to keep up two companies. His proposals, sent to the Lord Chamberlain July 19, 1705, were as follows: "(1) That the patent adventurers, on ceasing to act by virtue of their patent, be admitted to a moiety of the clear profits which shall arise from the company now established by the Queen in the Haymarket. (2) That there shall no regard be had to each company's past debts, engagements, or stock, their concern together being forward, not backwards. (3) That the persons to be intrusted for the management be named by the Queen, to be any time changed and removed as she shall think fit. (4) That if these three

principal heads be agreed to, the settlement of the inferior matters may be referred to my Lord Chamberlain." About the 25th of July, Mr. Rich sent back an answer to Sir J. Stanley, acknowledging a letter from the Chamberlain, "that it was his pleasure he should bring in proposals for uniting the companies. He urged fairly that he was concerned with about forty persons either as adventurers under the two patents, or as renters of Covent Garden and Dorset Garden. Now, to receive other persons as sharers would be a breach of trust, and the proprietors "would tear him to pieces with lawsuits." He had already drawn on himself many lawsuits. "Sir, I am a purchaser under the patents to above the value of £2,000 (a great part of which was under the marriage settlements of Dr. Davenant). After ten years' employment, expense, and diligence, I have succeeded in pleasing the town, and the profits begin to reimburse, and the result must be the undoing of myself and others, to raise great estates to Mr. Vanbrugge."

"After this," says our old prompter, "Captain Vanbrugge gave leave to Mr. Vergruggen and Mr. Booth, and all the young company, to act the remainder of the summer what plays they could by their own industry get up for their own benefit, continuing till Bartholomew eve, August 23, 1706. But all that time the profit amounted not to half the salaries they received in winter. From Bartholomew's day to the 15th of October following there was no more acting there. In the interval Vanbrugge had agreed with Swiney, with the concurrence of the Lord Chamberlain; transferred and invested the services and government of the theatre to Swiney, who brought with him from Mr. Rich, Mr. Wilks, Mr. Cibber, Mr. Mills, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Keene, Mr. Norris, Mr. Fairbank, Mr. Oldfield; united them to the old company; Mr. Betterton and Mr. Underhill being the only remains of the Duke of York's servants, from 1662 till the union in October, 1706. Now, having given an account of all the principal actors and plays down to 1706, I with the said union conclude my history."

When Sir John "Vanbrugge" proposed to enter on this business, he applied not directly to Rich, but to an agent or auxiliary of that person, a remarkable character in his way: "a sort of premier agent in his stage affairs, that seemed in appearance as much to govern the master as the master himself did to govern his actors; but this person was under no stipulation or salary for the service he rendered, but had gradually

wrought himself into the master's extraordinary confidence and trust from an habitual intimacy, a cheerful humour, and an indefatigable zeal for his interest. If I should further say that this person has been well known in almost every metropolis in Europe; that few private men have with so little reproach run through more various turns of fortune; that on the wrong side of three score, he has yet the open spirit of a hale young fellow of five-and-twenty; that though he still chooses to speak what he thinks to his best friends with an undisguised freedom, he is, notwithstanding, acceptable to many persons of the first rank and condition; that any one of them (provided he likes them) may now send him for their service to Constantinople at half a day's warning; that time has not yet been able to make a visible change in any part of him but the colour of his hair, from a fierce coal-black to that of a milder milk-white." It was, in short, Mr. Owen Swiney—probably M'Swiney—thus happily sketched, who, after an adventurous life, was able to secure a good fortune for his old age, which he bequeathed to Mrs. Woffington. To him Vanbrugge made an offer of his opera house, at the "casual rent" of £5 every acting night, the whole not to exceed £700 a year. Rich, it seems, was not disinclined, as he would really control both.

CHAPTER XIII.

A NEW MANAGER.

BUT now another change was to take place in the direction of Old Drury. Sir Thomas Skipwith, one of the "adventurers" who had advanced money on the patent, and holding equal share with Rich, had long since found himself, like the rest, driven from the control, owing to the arts of his astute manager, who by proceedings in the courts and other means had effectually prevented any accounts being furnished. This gentleman actually gave his property away either in disgust or in a moment of *gaieté de cœur*. In the month of October, 1707, then, Sir Thomas happened to be on a visit with a gentleman of his acquaintance in the country, a gay young man "about town," as it is called, of most attractive manners and fond of the theatre, with a fortune of about £2,000 a year, into which he had already "dipped" a little. He had "uncommon share

of sociality, a handsome person, and a sanguinary bloom on his complexion." And it is characteristic that what drew him behind the scenes was a longing for the pattern of a certain "fair, full-bottomed periwig" he had admired on the head of Mr. Cibber in the *Fool in Fashion*. He introduced himself with a request "to know the price of it. But upon his observing me a little surprised at the levity of his question, about a fop's periwig, he began to rally himself, with so much wit and humour, upon the folly of his fondness for it, that he struck me with an equal desire of granting anything in my power to oblige so facetious a customer. This singular beginning of our conversation, and the mutual laughs that ensued upon it, ended in an agreement to finish our bargain that night over a bottle." Both were delighted with each other's company; that single bottle "was the sire of many a jolly dozen." He seems to have been a most attractive gentleman. He "could not but see the youthful joy," says the comedian, "I was generally raised to, whenever I had the happiness of a *tête-à-tête* with him; and it may be a moot point, whether wit is not as often inspired by a proper attention as by the brightest reply to it. Therefore as he had wit enough for any two people, and I had attention enough for any four, there could not well be wanting a social delight on either side." Further: "I have heard a gentleman of condition say, who knew the world as well as most men that live in it, that let his discretion be ever so much upon his guard, he never fell into Mr. Brett's company without being loth to leave it, or carrying away a better opinion of himself from it." This fascination operated on the guest, and "the pleasantness of the place, and the agreeable manner of passing his time there, had raised him to such a gallantry of heart that, in return to the civilities of his friend the colonel, he made him an offer of his whole right in the patent; but not to over-rate the value of his present, told him he himself had made nothing of it these ten years. But the colonel (said he) being a greater favourite of the people in power, and (as he believed) among the actors too, than himself was, might think of some scheme to turn it to advantage, and in that light, if he liked it, it was at his service. After a great deal of raillery on both sides of what Sir Thomas had *not* made of it, and the particular advantages the colonel was likely to make of it, they came to a laughing resolution, that an instrument should be drawn the next morning of an absolute conveyance of the premises. A

gentleman of the law, well known to them both, happening to be a guest there at the same time, the next day produced the deed, and it was duly sealed and signed."

This Colonel Brett had a curious, adventurous, or rather romantic story. As Spence tells us, he "was a particular handsome man." Lady Rivers, looking out of a window, saw him arrested by bailiff, paid his debt, and married him. She left him well off at her death, on which he bought an estate, built a house, but from over-excitement in travelling to see it during the heats, he caught a fever and died. "Nobody had a better taste of what would please the town, and his opinions was much regarded by the actors and dramatists." It is said that Cibber introduced a pleasant incident from his life into one of his comedies.

Invested with this new office and authority there were serious difficulties before him, on which he consulted his friend the player, than whom no one knew better Mr. Rich's temper. This adviser directed him to take a firm position at once, to appear to take an interest and to understand and control, though he might not really do so, and above all, get the actors back again from the Haymarket and re-create the old monopoly, making that theatre the house of opera. This he actually contrived to do through his influence at Court.

The dislike of the Court, and its manifest wish to crush the old patentees, was now further shown by a fresh order of the imperious Chamberlain, Lord Kent, dated December 31, 1707 :

As by division of the comedians into two distinct houses players were not able to gain a reasonable subsistence, for their encouragement in either company, nor can plays be always acted to the best advantage, whereas the charge of opera and comedies at the same house is too great to be supported :

Therefore to remedy these inconveniences and for better regulation and support of the theatres, I do hereby order and require :

All operas to be at the Haymarket, with full power and authority to the manager to engage any performers in music, dancing, &c. And I do hereby strictly charge and forbid the manager to represent any comedies, tragedies, or any other entertainments of the stage, or to erect any other theatre for the purpose, upon pain of being silenced for breach of this my order.

I do hereby give to the management of the theatres in Drury Lane and Dorset Gardens full powers to engage any actors they may think fit, in spite of any articles or engagement they may have made with any other playhouse. This forbids operas and dancing at these theatres on pain of being silenced.

And for greater encouragement of the above-named theatres, I do further order and require that no person, society, or company of undertakers whatever do presume to erect any other theatre, or to represent comedy, tragedy, or operas . . . as they shall answer this contrary at their peril.²

Here was a fresh stretch of despotism, and the Court was growing every year more daring in its attempts at control. Almost at once the players received orders to return to Drury Lane, there to remain (under the patentees) her Majesty's only company of comedians. On January 13, 1708, the company once more left the Haymarket and were able to give out at Drury Lane, "By the United Company of Comedians," which included Wilks, Mills, Booth, Cibber, Johnson, Estcourt, Betterton, Bickerstaff, Pinkethman, Bullock, Keene, Cross, Fairbanks, Pack, Smith, Husband, Doggett, Leigh, Thurmond, Bowen. Mrs. Knight, Mountford, Barry, Rogers, Norris, Oldfield, Bradshaw, Powell, Porter, Cross, Saunders, Wills, Bicknell, Moore. We are further told that the whole company did not appear at first, Powell and Thurmond owing to gout and infirmities; Betterton now acted but seldom. The public then welcomed with their plaudits their long admired veteran, while he on his part displayed all his form, judgment, and genius.

Everything went well at first and to the satisfaction of all, save Mr. Rich.

For now every chief actor, according to his particular capacity, piqued himself upon rectifying those errors which, during their divided state, were almost unavoidable. Such a choice of actors added a richness to every good play, as it was then served up to the public entertainment. The common people crowded to them, with a more joyous expectation, and those of the higher taste returned to them, as to old acquaintances with new desires, after a long absence. In a word, all parties seemed better pleased, but he who one might imagine had most reason to be so, the (lately) sole managing patentee. He indeed saw his power daily mouldering from his own hands, into those of Mr. Brett, whose gentlemanly manner of making every one's business easy to him, threw their old master under a disregard, which he had not been used to, nor could with all his happy change of affairs, support. Although this grave theatrical minister, of whom I have been obliged to make such frequent mention, had acquired the reputation of a most profound politician, by being often incomprehensible, yet I am not sure that his conduct at this juncture, gave us not an evident proof that he was like other frail mortals, more a slave to his passions than

² Brit. Mus. Ad. MS. 20,726.

his interest; for no creature ever seemed more fond of power, that so little knew how to use it to his profit and reputation; otherwise he could not possibly have been so discontented in his secure and prosperous state of the theatre, as to resolve at all hazards to destroy it. We shall now see what infallible measures he took to bring this laudable scheme to perfection. He plainly saw, that as this disagreeable prosperity was chiefly owing to the conduct of Mr. Brett, there could be no hope of recovering the stage to its former confusion but by finding some effectual means to make Mr. Brett weary of his charge. The most probable he could, for the present, think of in this distress, was to call in the adventurers (whom for many years, by his defence in law, he had kept out) now to take care of their visibly improving interests. This fair appearance of equity, being known to be his own proposal, he rightly guessed would incline these adventurers to form a majority of votes on his side in all theatrical questions; and consequently become a check upon the power of Mr. Brett, who had so visibly alienated the hearts of his theatrical subjects, and now began to govern without him. When the adventurers, therefore, were re-admitted to their old government, after having recommended himself to them by proposing to make some small dividend of the profits (though he did not design that jest should be repeated), he took care that the creditors of the patent, who were then no inconsiderable body, should carry off the every week's clear profits, in proportion to their several dues and demands.

It is curious, however, that we find from another document, that Brett had devised his whole authority to Wilks, Estcourt, and Cibber himself, who makes no mention of this delegation. This paper shows how to something like a military commission the authority over the players was formally transferred. It had, of course, nothing to do with the patent:

March 31, 1708. By an indenture of this date between Henry Brett, Esq., and Robert Wilks, Richard Estcourt, and Colley Cibber, gentlemen, Brett deputed Wilks, Estcourt, and Cibber to perform plays new or old, "to take in, discharge, advance, take down, encourage and forfeit all actors, officers, servants, or agents." No sum was to be expended that exceeded in one week 40s. but with consent of all three. They covenanted to use their skill and endeavour to support the right of the patent, and after June 10th following there was to be "no benefit day or play," without depositing with the treasurer £40. An actor whose salary did not amount to £4, to leave in the treasurer's hands one part in four of his clear profits of such benefit play; an actor who had not 50s., a full third part; and those not above 40s., one moiety or half for use and benefit

of the patent, and of his business in general. Not to be any benefit play before the last week in February, and not more than one in a week from said last week in February to the month of May next following.

The latter clauses show that Rich had proper warrant for the harsh proceedings towards the players with which he was now to be charged.³ But he was helped in getting rid of this inconvenient adversary in a very singular way. Sir Thomas Skipwith, finding that the theatre was prospering, naturally repented of his rash gift, and insisting that the deed was meant to be a trust one, took proceedings in equity to get back his property. Colonel Brett, who seems to have been a gentleman, gave way, and on Sir Thomas's death, re-transferred it to his son Sir George.

Having thus got rid of Brett, Rich adopted his old tactics towards the performers, reducing their "salaries," "forfeiting" them, and at last forced them to sign a paper agreeing to the sacrifice of the third of the benefit profits. On this a fresh scene of confusion broke out. Once more we see how the control of the Crown could be exercised, most effectively in a logical point of view, but most arbitrarily and unreasonably. For on June 6th an order arrived, in the name of his Majesty, requiring the theatre to be closed, and to continue closed until further notice. The object was of course to punish the patentee for disobedience to a direction to satisfy his actors. Yet it punished them infinitely more.

After this first order had been given to Rich, judgment was as it were stayed to give time for reflection, and it was further conveyed to the actors that if they choose to desert, they would be encouraged and protected at the other house. This notification came from the Chamberlain's office. Of this advice they were not slow to profit, and a confederacy was formed, including Wilks, Doggett, Mrs. Oldfield, and Cibber, who proposed to join Swiney at the Opera House. All were to be "sharers"

³ Moody, in a letter dated March, 1798, said he had the following details from C. Rich, the brother of J. Rich. "Rich the father was an attorney, and had a client to whom Sir Thomas Skipwith owed a large sum. Rich, meeting the attorney of the latter, demanded payment. The other declared that the only asset was a patent to act plays by. They agreed to put it up by auction, and Rich bought it for £80. It was sold again in the lifetime of Christopher Rich at the rate of £80,000, for the present proprietors gave Mr. Colman £20,000 for his quarter. This Moody had from C. Rich at Mr. Coomby's, in Cook's Court, twenty-five years ago. No receipt having passed, they had to give Sir T. Skipwith's relatives a large sum to substantiate the property (this refers to Covent Garden Theatre)."

or *sociétaires*, except the lady who was excluded by the pleasant Doggett, who declared that things could not go well if more than one sex was admitted to the management. She had already had a *carte blanche* instead. The plot being thus arranged, the manager proceeded in his course, little suspecting what was in store for him.

When a sufficient number of actors were engaged, under our confederacy with Swiney, it was then judged a proper time for the Lord Chamberlain's power to operate, which, by lying above a month dormant, had so far recovered the patentees from any apprehensions of what might fall upon them from their late usurpations on the benefits of the actors, that they began to set their marks upon those who had distinguished themselves in the application for redress. Several little disgraces were put upon them, particularly in the disposal of parts in plays to be revived, and as visible a partiality was shown in the promotion of those in their interest, though their endeavours to serve them could be of no extraordinary use. All this while the other party were passively silent; until one day the actor who particularly solicited their cause at the Lord Chamberlain's office, being shown there the order signed for absolutely silencing the patentees and ready to be served, flew back with the news to his companions, then at the rehearsal, in which he had been wanted, when, being called to his part and something hastily questioned by the patentee for his neglect of business, this actor, I say, with an erected look and a theatrical spirit at once threw off the mask, and roundly told him: "Sir, I have now no more business here than you have; in half an hour you will neither have actors nor command, nor authority to employ them." The patentee who, though he could not readily comprehend his mysterious manner of speaking, had just a glimpse of terror enough from the words to soften his reproof into a cold formal declaration, that "if he could not do his work he should not be paid." But now, to complete the catastrophe of these theatrical commotions, enters the messenger with the order of silence in his hand, whom the same actor officiously introduced, telling the patentee that the gentleman wanted to speak to him from the Lord Chamberlain. When the messenger had delivered the order, the actor, throwing his head over his shoulder towards the patentee, in the manner of Shakespeare's Henry the Eighth to Cardinal Wolsey, cried: "Read o'er that! and now—to breakfast, with what appetite you may." The authority of the patent now no longer subsisting, all the confederating actors immediately walked out of the house, to which they never returned until they become themselves the tenants and masters of it. Here again we see an higher instance of the authority of a Lord Chamberlain than any of those I have elsewhere mentioned.

This other new licence being now in possession of the Drury Lane Theatre, those actors, whom the patentee ever since the order of silence

had retained in a state of inaction, all to a man came over to the service of Collier. Of these, Booth was then the chief. The merit of the rest had as yet made no considerable appearance, and as the patentee had not left a rag of their clothing behind him, they were but poorly equipped for a public review; consequently, at their first opening, they were very little able to annoy us. But during the *Trial of Sacheverel* our audiences were extremely weakened by the better rank of people daily attending it; while at the same time the lower sort, who were not equally admitted to that grand spectacle, as eagerly crowded into Drury Lane to a new comedy, called *The Fair Quaker of Deal*. This play, having some low strokes of natural humour in it, was rightly calculated for the capacity of the actors who played it and to the taste of the multitude, who were now more disposed and at leisure to see it; but the most happy incident in its fortune was the charm of the Fair Quaker, which was acted by Miss Santlow (afterwards Mrs. Booth), whose person was then in the full bloom of what beauty she might pretend to. Before this she had only been admired as the most excellent dancer, which perhaps might not a little contribute to the favourable reception she now met with as an actress in this character, which so happily suited her figure and capacity. The gentle softness of her voice, the composed innocence of her aspect, the modesty of her dress, the reserved decency of her gesture, and the simplicity of the sentiments that naturally fell from her, made her seem the amiable maid she represented.

Mr. Collier, being a "civilian" and a Member of Parliament, had influence enough to carry through any arrangement that he pleased, and presently made his own terms with the players. He made various successive arrangements, which he altered and cancelled as he found them unprofitable. He first fancied the opera at the Haymarket, and agreed to exchange with Swiney, the Lord Chamberlain favouring, but he required two hundred a year to be paid to him, and one night in the week *relâche* to give his opera a fairer chance. This was agreed, and both started on a new race. "After the comedians were in possession of Drury Lane, from whence during my time upon the stage they never departed, their swarm of audiences exceeded all that had been seen in thirty years before, which, however, I do not impute so much to the excellence of their acting as to their indefatigable industry." This the insatiable civilian noted, and "then, like a true liquorish courtier, began to meditate an exchange of theatrical posts with Swiney, who had visibly very fair pretensions to that he was in, by his being first chosen by the Court to regulate and rescue the stage from the disorders it had suffered under its former managers. Yet Collier knew

that that sort of merit could stand in no competition with his being a Member of Parliament. He therefore had recourse to his Court interest (where mere will and pleasure was the only law that disposed of all theatrical rights)." Poor Swiney was advised that it was vain to resist, and was driven abroad to foreign countries to begin a new career.

On this we find a number of excited petitions addressed to her Majesty by the persons of quality interested, and imploring redress. One signed by—

The Right Hon. Lord Guilford, the Right Hon. Lord John Harvey, Dame Alice Brownlow, widow, Ann Shadwell, widow, Sir Edward Smith, Bart., Sir Thomas Skipwith, Bart., George Sayer, Charles Killigrew, and Christopher Rich, Esquires, Charles Davenant, Doctor of Laws, John Metcalf, Thomas Goodall, Ashburnham Toll, Ashburnham Trowd, William East, Richard Middlemore, Robert Gower, and William Collier, Esquires, and several other persons claiming under the patents of the theatres. This petition states the particulars of the patents granted to Thomas Killigrew, Esq., and Sir William Davenant. That the patentees did build two playhouses upon several pieces of ground purchased by them respectively, the one in Covent Garden and the other in Salisbury Court, *which cost them £10,000 and upwards, and the house in Covent Garden having been accidentally burnt down, and afterwards rebuilt, cost near £4,000 more*; and that the patentees did, at their own costs, maintain and instruct people for the stage. That the patents were united in 1682, and the then patentees, for great sums of money, assigned their shares, or interests (now vested in the petitioners). That the petitioners, in confidence of such letters patent, had been at further expense, at several times, in apparel and other necessaries for the theatre, *to the extent of £20,000*. That the petitioners, after paying all the necessary expenses of the establishment, derived an annual profit of above £1,000 from the concern, until Lady Day, 1695, *since which time they became yearly considerable losers*. That they were at last, with the greatest reluctance, compelled to trouble her Majesty with an application to prevent their being brought into danger of losing their whole estates in the said premises; but they hoped that, in a reign so glorious as that of her Majesty for preserving the rights of the people, they should not be disturbed in the management of their concern. That her Majesty's Lord Chamberlain had sent several orders to the patentees and their managers, players, and performers, and in particular during the months of *November and December, 1705, relating to the establishing of another playhouse, and restraining the petitioners' power to treat with such actors as they should think necessary for their business*. Other orders were sent them in December and January, 1707, for restraining the petitioners from acting any operas, and from employing such persons as they conceived fit for

dancing and singing, under the penalty of silencing. On April 50, 1709, the petitioner's treasurer was ordered to pay moneys to their actors, without their consent or agreement; and on June 6th last the petitioners and actors were silenced for not so doing. That such orders *were not only extraordinary and contradictory in themselves*, but made without calling the petitioners before their lordship, or hearing them upon the subject, and, as they the petitioners were advised, contrary to the rights and privileges conveyed by the patents, and tended to subvert the same, and destroy the property of those claiming under them; and as the petitioners were refused redress by the Lord Chamberlain, although they frequently applied for the same, they at last had recourse to her Majesty's great justice and goodness. They therefore prayed her Majesty for relief against the said orders, and to restore them to that protection which they enjoyed under her royal predecessors.

The italicized portions show some interesting facts. Next came Mr. Charles Killigrew—

Stating that his father's right of the patent had been vested in him for the last twenty-seven years. That for the greatest part of the time since the two houses were united, Dr. Davenant, or those claiming under him, took upon themselves the management of the two theatres, and the company of actors, and received the profits arising from the concern, which ought to have been divided into twenty equal shares, three parts of which belonged to the petitioner. That, as his share of the property was at the time of his marriage looked upon to be of considerable value, it formed a part of the settlement made upon his wife and their issue. He therefore hoped that, as he had not interfered with the management of the theatre for the last fourteen years, her Majesty would not allow his family to suffer through the use of the patent being suspended.

Also a petition from the unfortunate "silenced" actors—

B. Booth, Theo. Keene, Jno. Bickerstaffe, Fran. Leigh, Hen. Fairbank, Ja. Carnaby, Jo. Downes, Geo. Powell, George Park, John Cowdy, Thomas Harman, Mat. Burkhead, Fran. M. Knight, M. Bicknell, Henrietta Moore, Kat. Finch, Susannah Cox, L. Bradshaw, Mary Powell, Eliz. Leigh, Eliz. Willis, M. Kent, Cath. Baker—all performers at Drury Lane Theatre—states that the Chamberlain having an unhappy difference with the patentees and managers occasioned by the intricate proceedings of some particular dissatisfied comedians, did on June 6th last silence patentees, by which comedians were reduced to the lowest want. They petitioned Lord Chamberlain June 10th, June 20th, July 5th, so now appeal to the Queen. That they had not incurred the Lord Chamberlain's displeasure, as his lordship has been often pleased to declare, on the order and rules of decency. That the patentees, who his lordship declares are the only offenders, sustain no damage by this suspension at this time of the year, having no power

of profit from July 10th to October 10th, as appears by the articles of agreement—that time being for the young comedians at their own risk. The only redress he gives is to allow managers in Haymarket to receive and employ such of *your Majesty's sworn comedians* as they think fit to take. But they could not do it, as such an engagement is opposed to their interest and inclinations, and also forfeit of their honesty to their masters, and would expose them to penalties for breach of agreement. For having power and authority from the Lord Chamberlain by an order dated December 31, 1707, to be received, taken in, and employed by the patentees of Drury Lane, did agree to act there and nowhere else. So must be inevitably ruined if they do not act at Drury Lane. That both patentees and they are fully contented with each other. So petition that, notwithstanding Lord Chamberlain has some power over them as being your Majesty's sworn servants, hope they will not be brought into a worse condition than other of your Majesty's subjects who enjoy the property and benefit of honest and lawful care. They also inform the Queen they reap no advantage by salary, livery, or any other consideration (as the sworn comedians formerly have done under your Majesty's royal predecessors), so that your Majesty's petitioners look upon themselves as left to their own liberties to make the best provision they can for the maintainance of themselves and their families, and do not despair of your Majesty's royal favour and protection while they shall behave themselves with decency and modesty in their several capacities. Hope carries this deplorable case into your wise and tender consideration. That the Lord Chamberlain's displeasure may not extend to the utter ruin of your Majesty's innocent petitioners and their families, which must certainly follow unless you give leave to act at Drury Lane while the quarrel is arranged. Highest charity to above one hundred persons—Booth, Th. Keene, J. Bickerstaffe (?), F. Leigh, Hen. Fairbank (?), Carnaby, Downes, Powell, Knight, Henrietta Moore (?), Kath. Finch, Susan. Cox, L. Bradshaw, Mary Powell, Eliz. Leigh, Eliz. Willis, M. Kent, Cath. Baker.

Fresh orders came from Sir John Stanley in June, but no attention being paid to them, a further imperative order came putting them to silence.

From the curious papers preserved in the British Museum we can gather all the incidents that followed—the mixture of violence and chicanery. The appeal was heard in presence of the Queen herself in Council at St. James', on February 18, 1709. "The petition of Dame Brownlow and others was read against the silencing order and the licence lately granted to one Mr. Collier (who pretended to have some right under the patents, and formerly associated with petitioners for the preservation of his properties), to act plays and receive the

benefit and exclude all persons claiming under the letters patent. An order made to be referred to Attorney General and Solicitor General."

Not until October, 1711, did the law officers, Northey and Raymond, give an opinion, when they reported that they had heard the parties to the matter. They reviewed all the patents from the beginning with the devolution of title to 1690, when "Rich was now seized." They showed that the clear profits of a single year, ending June, 1709, amounted to over £1,000, "after three parts in twenty thereof being taken out, as belonging to Charles Killigrew; the rest being divided into ten parts, Rich claiming only two parts of such ten shares, the other eight belonging to the other petitioners claiming as mortgagees or purchasers, for whom the said John Rich admits himself as only trustee for them." The "opinion" then goes on to set out how on "September 6, 1709, Sir John Stanley wrote to Rich and the actors that they were not to play any more till another order; and this order of your Majesty was because they had presumed to publish bills for a play to be acted by such company, notwithstanding an order of June 6, 1709, made by the Lord Chamberlain, by which the said company was silenced for not obeying a former order, dated April 30th, whereby patentees' treasurer was required to pay to the respective comedians who had benefit plays that winter all the moneys produced by such plays, deducting only £40 each play for the charge of the house. That the said Rich, besides such charge, stopped one-third of the receipts for the use of the company, and so did not obey, alleging the comedians had a particular agreement with him in writing, and that the patentees were not obliged to submit to an order by the Lord Chamberlain, who is not so much as named or mentioned in the letters patent, but took on himself to dispose of the money of the proprietors without their consent. Rich and the company yielded full obedience to the royal order."

He continued in possession, "foreborn to act ever since," till November 22, 1707, "when Mr. Collier came with a corporal and divers soldiers," two files of musketeers, "armed with swords and muskets, and in a violent manner broke open the doors of the said theatre, turned out Rich's servants, and declared he had your Majesty's order: took possession of the scenes, clothes, &c., and acted ever since."

Collier justified his proceedings by a letter from Sir J.

Stanley, dated November 19, 1709. The whole was a most extraordinary and significant, and was indeed, a battle between the Court and its opponents.

November 19, 1709.

My Lord Chamberlain has directed me to acquaint you that in consideration of your having surrendered all your interest and claims to the patents granted Mr. Killigrew and Sir W. Davenant, and your submission to her Majesty's authority, her Majesty is graciously pleased to permit you to act comedies and tragedies in the theatre in Drury Lane, the first play not to be acted before Wednesday next, being the 23rd instant. And I am further to acquaint you that her Majesty's licence empowering you accordingly is preparing, and will be speedily sent you, and you are strictly required by his lordship *not to suffer Mr. Rich or any other person claiming under the aforesaid patents to be any way considered in the management of that company of comedians under this direction.* You are also surely required to observe all such regulations as have been made for the better government of her Majesty's Theatre, more particularly her Majesty's order forbidding any person to come behind the scenes or stand upon the stage.⁴

There was also added an affidavit made by Collier, dated January 8, 1710:

Who swore that in the year 1709, the Chamberlain having silenced the players, he, Collier, being a sharer in the patents, having consulted his and the other titles to said patents, was advised said patents were of no effect *unless supported by Crown.* So he and Sir T. Skipwith declined acting or joining in opposition to the Queen's pleasure. Later was told that the Queen, if he would submit, and waive patents, or surrender them, would give leave to act. So Collier and Skipwith did so, and Collier actually surrendered his title-deed to the Solicitor General. In November, 1709, he had leave to employ the players, who at that time were in a very low condition, and on or about the 22nd day of the said month, November, it being a day of public rejoicing, he ordered a bonfire to be made before the playhouse door, and gave the players money to drink your Majesty's health, and the then Lord Chamberlain's, and to rejoice for the victory which was that day commemorated. And that he came that evening to the playhouse, and showed the players Sir John Stanley's letter, and told them they might act as soon as they pleased, for that he had the Queen's leave to employ them. Upon which the players themselves and some soldiers got into the playhouse, and the next day performed a play, but not the play that was given out, for Rich had carried away the clothes; so they were forced to play in their own clothes till stage clothes could be got for them. Collier said also, he had the consent of the major part of the renters to get into the said house, and they all received their share, he said, and

⁴ British Museum, Ad. MSS., 20,726.

Rich has received his as well as the others, it being left in the office for him till June last, when Rich and others turned him out, and held it in opposition to proprietors till November last, when Collier again got into possession. Collier holds it by leave from the major part of the renters, and hath let the same to Mr. Swiney, Mr. Wilks, Mr. Dogget, and Mr. Cibber, who now play in virtue of her Majesty's licence. Collier swears that he never said he had the Queen's authority for anything, but to employ the players, to maintain their families, and divert the town. Nor did he send for, nor know of the soldiers being there until he saw them. He received no advantage from players all last year, but gave all the receipts to players, to maintain them and their families, in compassion to them, and in obedience to the Queen to support her prerogative in opposition to the said patentees.

The Attorney General notes that the lease, however, bears date November 15, 1710, more than a year after the forcible entry, that being on November 22, 1709. So Attorney and Solicitor Generals humbly testify that Collier hath not proved or produced to us any right or title he had claiming under said letters patent.

This specious account of the shifty lawyer was not consistent in other matters. For

The patentees, to make out that Collier declined to act with them in preservation of their properties under patents, and to show the sentiments he expressed of the Lord Chamberlain's proceedings, and of the validity of the patent at time of its being silenced, proceeded to use his letters :

"September 13, 1709.

"Sir,—Yours I received, and am as much surprised at the late order sent as you can be. I thought that matters had been so settled that you would have met with no other interruption from playing than to have one taken and then to be bailed, in order to try the validity of the Lord Chamberlain's order against the patents. I must do Sir J. Stanley the justice that he did not consent that we should play ; but if we did it was also used as above, and that was all we desired, and that was the Lord Chamberlain's own method, and, as I apprehended, the only way to satisfy everybody that it is pretty plain his lordship's methods are regarded, and it is very difficult to know who to obey. There is a secret in this matter which time will bring to light. In the meantime, I cannot see we have anything to do but to petition the Queen in our names, and set forth the whole matter, which, when rightly stated, I am of opinion her Majesty will readily do us justice, who are so very much injured and oppressed against reason, justice, and all the known laws of the land."

Then adds, he cannot come to town ; but will join with whatever Mr. Rich, Wodall, and Metcalfe and rest shall think fit to do.

"I will consent too for Sir Thomas Skipwith and myself, for

matters are now carried so high, that I think it impracticable to sue for favour by any other method than the rules of Westminster Hall. Only first to petition the Queen that her Majesty will be pleased to try our right under her ancestor's patent, and that she will countenance us in such manner as the Kings and Queens of England have always done, and not suffer her subjects to be injured and oppressed by any private person put in authority under her. It is the undoubted right of the subject to be heard before he is condemned; but we have execution passed and executed upon us without any legal trial or sentence given. I would have the matter carried on the strictest manner it can be, and since we are to receive no favour, not to give any, nor to spare any one of what quality or distinction soever this offer to make an ill use of the crown's power. I am sorry that any one should suffer for being firm to his own engagements and undertakings, especially yourself. For my part, I will do all I can to protect you. I contribute in proportion to keep you and the rest that stand by the patents, in spite of any one's private interest. I hope the Queen will not by any means be persuaded to act in an arbitrary way, it being what she always has abhorred, ever since her glorious and auspicious reign. I am in no manner of pain but we shall have justice done us, and ample satisfaction made for the violence used in the affair. If you write to me, let your letter be left, and my clerk will read it to me. My humble services to all friends, and believe me to be your assured friend and humble servant,

"W. COLLIER."

This was addressed "to Mr. Bart. Rich."

The pleasant editor of the *Tatler*, who was some years later to take his full share in the theatrical disputes, seemed to have a special antipathy to Rich, and in his journal ridiculed these proceedings :

This is to give notice, that a magnificent palace, with great variety of gardens, statues, and water-works, may be brought cheap in Drury Lane; where there are likewise several castles to be disposed of, very delightfully situated; as also groves, woods, forests, fountains, and country seats, with very pleasant prospects on all sides of them; being the moveables of Ch—r R—ch, Esq., who is breaking up house-keeping, and has many curious pieces of furniture to dispose of, which may be seen between the hours of six and ten in the evening.

The Inventory.

Spirits of right Nants brandy, for lambent flames and apparitions. Three bottles and a half of lightning. One shower of snow in the whitest French paper. Two showers of a browner sort. A sea, consisting of a dozen large waves, the tenth bigger than ordinary, and a little damaged. A dozen and a half of clouds trimmed with black, and well conditioned. A rainbow a little faded. A set of clouds after the French mode, streaked with lightning and furbelowed. A new

moon, something decayed. A pint of the finest Spanish wash, being all that is left of two hogsheads sent over last winter. A coach very finely gilt, and little used, with a pair of dragons, to be sold cheap. A setting sun, a pennyworth. An imperial mantle, made for Cyrus the Great, and worn by Julius Cæsar, Bajazet, King Harry the Eighth, and Signior Valentini. A basket-hilt sword, very convenient to carry milk in. Roxana's night-gown. Othello's handkerchief, &c. &c.

On another occasion he thus describes the violent proceedings of Rich, under the name of Divito.

I have ever had the sense of the thing, and for that reason have rejoiced that my ancient coeval friend of Drury Lane, though he had sold off most of his moveables, still kept possession of his palace, and trembled for him when he had lately likely to have been taken by a stratagem. There have for many ages been a certain learned sort of unlearned men in this nation called attorneys, who have taken upon them to solve all difficulties by increasing them, and are called upon to the assistance of all who are lazy, or weak of understanding. The insolence of a ruler of this place made him resign the possession of it to the management of my above-mentioned friend Divito. Divito was too modest to know when to resign it, till he had the opinion and sentence of the law for his removal. Both these in length of time were obtained against him. But as the great Archimedes defended Syracuse with so powerful engines, that if he threw a rope or piece of wood over the wall, the enemy fled; so Divito had wounded all adversaries with so much skill, that men feared even to be in the right against him. For this reason, the lawful ruler set up an attorney to expel an attorney, and chose a name dreadful to the stage, who only seemed able to beat Divito out of his entrenchments.

On the 22nd instant, a night of public rejoicing, the enemies of Divito made a largess to the people of faggots, tubs, and other combustible matter, which was erected into a bonfire before the palace. Plentiful cans were at the same time distributed among the dependences of that principality; and the artful rival of Divito observing them prepared for enterprize, presented the lawful owner of the neighbouring edifice, and showed his deputation under him. War immediately ensued upon the peaceful empire of wit and the muses; the Goths and Vandals sacking Rome, did not threaten a more barbarous devastation of arts and sciences. But when they had forced their entrance, the experienced Divito had detached all his subjects, and evacuated all his stores. The neighbouring inhabitants report, that the refuse of Divito's followers marched off the night before disguised in magnificence; door-keepers came out clad like cardinals, and scene-drawers like heathen gods. Divito himself was wrapped up in one of his black clouds, and left to the enemy nothing but an empty stage, full of trap-doors, known only to himself and his adherents.

PERCY FITZGERALD.

The Upanishads.¹

PART THE FIRST.

THE name of the Upanishads is applied to a large number of treatises which contain what has been called the philosophic portion of the Veda. The word Upanishad means literally "a sitting down beside, or at the feet of," a teacher,² and but for the loose sense in which the English word has come to be used, the title "the Upanishads" might very fairly be translated "the Conferences." The dialogue is the ideal form of an Upanishad, the pupil asking questions which give his master occasion to develop his doctrine; but the replies are generally so long that we forget the pupil until some such phrase as "'Please, sir, inform me still more' said the son," reminds us of his existence. Sometimes even this slight pretence at dialogue is dropped, and the Upanishad becomes a continuous discourse.

The Upanishads are very numerous; probably there are not less than two hundred books called by the name, and they are of various dates. We hear even of an Allah-Upanishad, the very name of which tells of something later than the Moslem conquest. For many of them the determination of the date is a difficult problem, the solution of which will always be a matter of dispute, a problem in many cases hardly worth the solving. We are told that "the Upanishads belong to what Hindu theologians call *Sruti*, or revealed literature."³ We presume that this remark is meant to apply only to the older Upanishads, for it is not easy to see what claim could be set up, even on Hindu principles, for a book calling itself an Upanishad, but clearly of recent origin. For us, at least, the only Upanishads

¹ *The Sacred Books of the East*, vol. i.—The Upanishads. Translated by F. Max Müller. Part I. The *Khândogya-upanishad*, the *Talavakâra-upanishad*, the *Aitareya-âraṇyaka*, the *Kaushîtaki-brâhmana-upanishad*, and the *Vâgasaneyi-samhitâ-upanishad*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1879.

² The root is *SAD*, to sit (Cf. Lat. *sed-ew*) with the prefixes *ni*, down, and *upa*, near to, just below, opposed to *apa*, away from (Cf. Gk. *êro* and *âro*).

³ Introduction, p. lxvii.

that can have much interest are those that plainly belong to the older literature of India, the literature that (to adopt Professor Max Müller's own division) is antecedent to the rise of Buddhism in the sixth century B.C. Indian chronology is a doubtful field, but we may certainly take as the oldest Upanishads those which are, as it were, embodied in the Veda, and form a distinct feature of the Vedic literature. The oldest part of the Rig-Veda⁴ is the *Samhitâ*, or collection of hymns more than a thousand in number, and not all of the same date nor belonging to exactly the same order of ideas. Out of this *Samhitâ*, two other arrangements of hymns have been made, with a few additions from other sources, these new collections being intended for use at certain sacrifices. They are known as the *Sâma-Veda* and the *Yagur-Veda*: of this last again there are two recensions, the "Black" and the "White Yagur-Veda." Later still comes the *Atharva-Veda*, containing some older elements and some of the hymns of the Rig-Veda, but full of traces of fetishism and magic, and much below its older prototype in the standard of religious feeling which it represents. For the present we may leave the *Atharva-Veda* out of account, and speak only of the Rig-Veda and the two collections immediately formed from it, just as the arrangement of psalms for an office of the Church is made from the psalter. The hymns of the Veda are detached compositions; it would not be easy to discover any system in them, and it would be impossible to form out of them any consistent body of doctrine. Very early a kind of magical power was supposed to attach to their words; their repetition, accompanied by complex ceremonies, became a chief feature in the Hindu religion. As the Veda was transmitted orally, the class who could devote long years to learning it by heart, listening to explanations of its meaning, or oftener still of the powers conferred by the knowledge of it and the wonders to be worked by its due recitation, became a more and more important one. The complexity of the sacrifices and ceremonies, the obligation of having frequent recourse to them, and the belief that dire results would follow either their omission or their erroneous performance, made the existence and the perpetuation of this class a necessity. None could enter it unless born into it; the Brahman was born, not made; and so the priestly caste stood at the head of a vast

⁴ Veda (root VID, to distinguish, see, Lat. Video, Gk. *oîda*) means literally knowledge, Rig-Veda (root *rik*, to praise) = Veda of praise or hymn-Veda.

system of ceremonial and of law. How it reached this position is a matter of conjecture and of dispute. We have no history of India. A people who were ever enlarging the bounds of their vast sacred literature have left us no annals by which we can trace their history, even in times when, in other lands, we find trustworthy historical materials at our command. This much is clear,—in old Aryan days, as in the patriarchal times of Israel, there was no organized priesthood, but the father of the family or the chief of the tribe was the priest of his household or of his people. Nor does the Veda give evidence of the existence of a priesthood in the earlier days of the Indo-Aryan people at all corresponding to the Brahmanic priesthood of the later period. Caste had not yet become an institution, but even in the Veda the Brahman is already beginning to struggle forward to his post of eminence. The name might be translated prayer-man if we could be quite sure that prayer was the original meaning of the word *Brahma*⁵ from which it was derived. *Brahma* clearly means prayer in the Veda, but perhaps more in the sense of a spell than anything else. Thus the later *Atharva-Veda*, abounding as it does in magical formulæ, is especially called the *Brahma-Veda*. *Brahma* came later to mean a power that sustained and was the source of all things, and the Brahman, at first the prayer-man or priest, came to be regarded as the highest human manifestation of this power. Perhaps it was while the Aryans were consolidating their Indian conquests that the system of caste received its first main development. The *Sūdras*—the lowest caste—are clearly the conquered race. In the early Brahmanical literature they are not recognized as Aryans; the term only applies to the three

⁵ Brahman, in the sense of a priest or member of the highest caste, has so nearly become an English word, that of the two forms, Brahman and Brahma, we prefer to use the latter in the sense in which it is used in the text. But it is all but impossible to avoid some confusion in the use of words belonging to this group. They come up at every turn when we have to deal with the religions of India, but there hardly can be said to be any fixed usage as to the forms in which they should appear in a page of English. It may therefore be well to note here that Brahman and Brahma (neuter) alike mean (1) prayer, worship, (2) the supreme soul of all things. The first form, Brahman, is the crude, uninflected base, the second the nominative case of the same word. Brahma (neuter) must not be confounded with *Brahmā* (masculine), the name of the first member of the Hindu triad of gods emanating from the neuter impersonal, Brahma. Again, the neuter form, Brahman, must be distinguished from the masculine Brahman, a prayer-man, priest. In this sense the form *Brāhman*, with the long *ā*, is often adopted. To use the full form, *Brāhmāna*, has the disadvantage of bringing in one more unfamiliar term, and one oftener used in English books to denote the ritual portion of the Veda.

higher castes. Loud and deep are the curses of the Brahman writers against the Sûdras; and the sacred laws, while hedging round the life of a Brahman with terrible sanctions, and fining the slayer of a Kshatriya a thousand cows, the slayer of a Vaisya a hundred, accepts ten for the death of a Sûdra, and contemptuously adds—

If a crow, a chameleon, a peacock, a Brâhmanî duck, a *Hansa*, the vulture called Bhâsa, a frog, an ichneumon, a musk-rat, or a dog has been killed, then the same penance as for a Sûdra must be performed.⁶

The earliest word for caste is Varna, *i.e.* colour, the Sûdras are the dark-faced Dravidian peoples, hated, despised, trampled on by their conquerors; the Vaisyas are the middle class of the country, the lowest of the conquerors, tillers of the soil—a soil that yields its fruit with little labour—they are prosperous men, marrying among themselves, hating the Sûdras as much as their betters do, and easily falling into a caste in the looser sense in which the farmers are a class or caste in most countries. Above them are two powers, rivals it is clear at times, the men of thought, the Brahmans, and the men of action, the sword-girt Kshatriyas. Both would be certain to hedge themselves round with privileges and protection, both would feel a common superiority over the Vaisya, a common hatred of the Sûdra; but once the Kshatriyas began to form a marked class, training their sons to battle, conquest and command, and the Brahmans made the teaching of the Veda, the knowledge of magical formulæ, and the rites of sacrifice family heirlooms, these classes became hereditary castes, and given the spirit of ceremonial religion so characteristic of India, the class that possessed all the sacrificial lore of the land was sure to rule in the end and to become the law-givers of the people. The Kshatriyas, it is true, resisted in some instances the Brahman claims, but without success. Legends recorded in the Purâṇas and the Mahābhārata hand down their names as those of wicked kings who strove in vain against the gods and their representatives. Yet the Brahmans did not seek to take the place of the kings. In their system the Kshatriya soldier and prince had his place as clearly marked as theirs, and thus there was a common guide for agreement and cooperation between the two classes. We cannot trace the steps by which the system was elaborated, but its outcome was this: caste, developed so

⁶ Âpastamba, i. 9, 25; *Sacred Books*, vol. ii. p. 83.

as to favour the Brahmans in all things, became the very soul of the law of India; the performance of complex ceremonies and sacrifices, with a marked tendency to assume a magical character, became the practical religion of the country, and the knowledge of the Veda, as interpreted by its guardians, the Brahmans, the sum of human knowledge. The laws, at first existing as oral tradition, were embodied in the *Dharmasâstras* or law books, and later on collected in the verse of Manu. The sacrifices gave rise to a whole literature of the *Brâhmanas*, books some of which are attached to each of the Vedas in order to direct how and with what ceremonies the hymns were to be used in sacrifice, and explaining their efficacy and their meaning. Wearisome disorderly compositions these *Brâhmanas* seem to be; if they contained the learning of the Veda it was in a form so subsidiary to their ceremonial part that a new order of books was necessary to set it forth by itself, as knowledge only apart from ceremony. These books are the *Âranyakas* or forest books (*Âranya*=a forest or wilderness), destined for the study of the man who having passed through the two first stages of life as ordained by the sacred law, namely studentship and married life, and having brought up a son to perform for him the sacred rites after his death, retires into the forest to live a kind of hermit's life, where a deeper knowledge of Vedic lore is to suffice instead of sacrifice and ceremony. But such sacrifices and ceremonies were held to be a necessary preparation for the higher life of contemplation and knowledge. They were held to have a purifying effect on the intellect, if recourse were had to them for this end. Without such preparation the mind could no more grasp the higher knowledge than the dull surface of an earthen jar could reflect the face as it is mirrored in a sheet of water. This theory was necessary to save the credit of the whole sacrificial system, and at the same time it was held that to become a hermit without having passed through the previous stages was to become an outcast.⁷ But even in the *Aranyakas* the theory of complete absence from the sacrifice does not seem to be consistently upheld. They contain sacrificial rules, but these are followed again by chapters giving

⁷ *Âpastamba* enumerates (i. 6 and 7, *Sacred Books*, vol. ii. pp. 67—69) those with whom food must not be eaten, and names among them "a person who has become a hermit without being authorized thereto by the rules of the law." Brahmans who neglect their duties, drunkards, madmen, spies, and other disreputable characters fall under the same ban.

a mystic meaning to the explicit directions which have gone before. Thus in the Aitareya-Āraṇyaka, forming part of the volume before us, we have first directions of wearisome length for the performance of the rite known as the Mahāvratā ceremony, then come a second and third part, in which the writer endeavours to show that all the ceremony shadows forth that knowledge of Brahma, which is a higher path than that of sacrifice, though all cannot attain it. The first part of this book is nothing but a Brāhmaṇa, the second is an Upanishad. The Upanishads form the third stratum of Vedic literature, they presuppose the Samhitas and the Brāhmaṇas, the hymns and the ritual, they are crowded with references to the gods invoked in the hymns and the rites described in the Brahmanas, but their burden is this: All the gods, all this world, myself and yourself, all that is, was and will be, is but the varying form of one underlying essence, called by some Brahma, the power that pervades all things, by others Ātman, the inmost self or soul of the universe: this is the one reality, all else is delusion: sacrifice is good, but knowledge is better, for it is the higher knowledge alone that can free men from the necessity of a painful existence in successive births on earth, by giving him back his lost consciousness of identity with the essence that underlies all things, so that from the repose of contemplation he may pass into absolute absorption into the soul of all things. This briefly is what the Upanishads say most diffusely with endless repetition, frequent obscurity, and occasional self-contradiction. The men who composed them seem to have been incapable of ever first stating a doctrine clearly and then proving it, rather they chose to discourse on this or that topic and let their doctrine colour what they said, and glimmer out through obscure allusion, or incomplete exposition. The brief phrase that clearly states a thought is the exception not the rule, and the current of the teacher's words is suddenly broken off by digressions *à propos* of nothing. The germs of their ideas are to be traced in some of the hymns of the Veda, they come out still more clearly in parts of the Brāhmaṇas. There was certainly a period of evolution of this pantheistic doctrine (it can hardly yet be called a system), and that period began after the Indo-Aryans had separated from the Iranians, and later than the date of most of the Vedic hymns. The course of that development is difficult to trace, it is still one of the open problems of our subject.

Professor Max Müller, in the latter part of his Hibbert Lectures, has proposed a theory which, ingenious as it is, seems to us hardly to explain the facts, and to lay far too much stress on certain features of early Brahmanism which, read in the light of the nineteenth century, have a deeper meaning than they bore for the teachers of the Veda who cast their thoughts in the strange mould of the Upanishads. He rightly insists that caste in those early days was not what it is now, but we cannot help thinking that his attempt to represent the Upanishad as something more than the literature of a learned class is a failure. He remarks that—

Before the ancient language and literature of India had been made accessible to European scholarship it was the fashion to represent the Brahmins as a set of priests jealously guarding the treasures of their sacred wisdom from the members of all the other castes, and thus maintaining their ascendancy over an ignorant people. It requires but the slightest acquaintance with Sanskrit literature to see the utter groundlessness of such a charge. One caste only, the Sûdras, were prohibited from knowing the Veda. With the other castes, the military and civil classes, a knowledge of the Veda, so far from being prohibited, was a sacred duty. All had to learn the Veda, the only privilege of the Brahmins was that they alone were allowed to teach it.⁸

But we confess that the old charge still seems to us to be little more than a clumsy, misleading way of stating a real fact. As sole teachers of the Veda, the Brahmins must have possessed a knowledge of it equalled by few among the nobles and princes, and fewer still among the Vaisyas. We hear at times of kings as wise as Brahmins, but they are spoken of as the exception not the rule. The teaching of the Upanishads as the Appendix to the Veda, and the sum of its knowledge, was in Brahman hands, and the obligation of knowing the Veda imposed on the two other classes was clearly not the obligation to know the Upanishad portion with its obscurely worded doctrines, but the obligation of being able to repeat the hymns essential to certain ever-recurring ceremonies. The very fact that in the Upanishads themselves Brahma is the centre of all existence, gave the Brahman the means of substantiating his claim to be held the highest emanation of the deity, all but a god himself. And after all the Upanishad doctrines could only be the property of the few, even though some Kshatriyas shared them with the Brahmins, so that there was still a

⁸ *Hibbert Lectures*, 1878, pp. 341, 342.

religion of ceremonial, magic and idolatry for the mass of the people, and for the learned few a philosophic pantheism. Thus the old belief about India was not utterly groundless, it was a misrepresentation indeed, but not a fabrication of something utterly false.

But we are branching off into a premature discussion of Professor Max Müller's theory. Before dealing with it, it will be well to say something of the modern study of the Upanishads, and then to examine one of them at some length as a specimen of the whole. We shall select for this purpose the *Khândogya* Upanishad of the Sama-Veda which, together with the *Brihad-âraṇyaka* of the Yagur-Veda, may be regarded as the foundation of the Vedânta or pantheistic philosophy of the Indian schools. For our survey of the modern study of the Upanishads we shall draw our materials chiefly from Professor Max Müller's exhaustive and most interesting Introduction to the volume before us.

In the last century Persian was what Sanskrit is now, the master-key to the lore of the East. In the Bodleian at Oxford, secured to the wall by a chain, was a strange book which no one could read, the *Vendidad* of the Parsis, a portion of the *Zend-Avesta*, then yet unknown to Europe.⁹ A fac-simile of four pages of the Oxford MS. fell into the hands of Abraham Hyacinth Anquetil Duperron, then a young student of Hebrew, Arabic, and Persian in the schools of Paris. Duperron was filled with the desire of going to India, obtaining from the Parsis copies of their sacred books, gaining from Parsi teachers a clue to their meaning, and giving to Europe at once the first complete copy of the books of Zoroaster and the first translation of them. In India the French and English were setting up and deposing Rajahs and Nabobs as they strove against each other for the Empire of the East, and Clive was winning his way to fame as a great commander. Anquetil Duperron probably cared little and knew less about the "Indian Question" of the day, when in 1755 he enlisted in a French regiment bound for India, and embarked at L'Orient, nominally to fight against Clive as a private in the ranks, really to look out for the books of Zoroaster. We shall not here attempt to tell the story of his three years of adventurous life in India. Even a glance at them reminds us that the men who have gathered the material and built up the structure of the science of language

⁹ Prof. Darmsteter's Introduction to the *Zend-Avesta*, *Sacred Books*, vol. iv.

are not all toilers at the desk, searchers of dictionaries, and revisers of texts. There are romantic and heroic pictures in the history of the study of language: Anquetil Duperron on board the crowded transport; Castren in our own day traversing on his sledge the Siberian wastes to gather knowledge of the Turanian tongues in the huts of Yakuts and Ostiaks; and two hundred years ago, De Nobili in his Brahman dress at Madura making his first studies of Sanskrit in days when the Veda was still unheard of in Europe or even in India by European ears. Anquetil Duperron was successful in his self-imposed mission, he came back to Europe to publish the Zend-Avesta, and to contend for years against men who could see in it nothing but a clumsy forgery. With this old controversy we have here nothing to do, we have spoken of Anquetil Duperron's Indian journey for the sake of one of its later results. He is well known as the discoverer of the Zend-Avesta, but he is far less widely remembered as the first who gave to Europe a version of some of the Upanishads. The version was a second-hand one. In the seventeenth century a number of the Upanishads had been translated from Sanskrit into Persian by or for Dārā Shukoh, the brother of Aurangzib, and from this Persian version Anquetil Duperron made his Latin translation, which he published in 1801-2 under the title of "*Oupnek'hat, or secret theological and philosophical doctrine of the Hindus.*"¹⁰ A wonderful version it is, a very miracle of obscurity, for he has forced the Latin into the mould of the Persian syntax, and leaves untranslated a large number of Sanskrit terms in Persian spelling which stand out in his pages of Perso-Latin like fossils in a layer of rock or hard flints in a chalk cliff. If only to show what a thoroughly literal translation can be, we give in a note a few lines of this version compared with the corresponding passage of Professor Max Müller's English.¹¹

¹⁰ The full title as given by Professor Max Müller is itself a curiosity: "*Oupnek'hat, id est Secretum tegendum: opus ipsa in India rarissimum continens antiquam et arcanam, seu theologicam et philosophicam doctrinam, e quattuor sacris Inderum libris Rak baid, Djedjer baid, Sam baid, Athrbai baid excerptam: ad verbum e Persico idiomate, Samskreticis vocabulis intermixto, in Latinum conversum: Dissertationibus et Annotationibus difficiliora explanantibus illustratum: studio et opera Anquetil Duperron, Indicopleustæ. Argentorati, typis et impensis fratrum Levrault, vol. i. 1801, vol. ii. 1802.*"

¹¹ Anquetil Duperron, *Oupnek'hat*. M. M. *Āṇḍogya Upanishad*, p. 1. Oum hoc verbum (esse) adkit ut sciveris, Let a man meditate on the syllable Om, sic ṛd maschghouli fac (de eo meditare), called the Udgitha: for the Udgitha (a quod ipsum hoc verbum aodkit est: portion of the Sama-Veda) is sung beginning with Om. The full account, how-

Anquetil Duperron's Oupnek'hat fell into the hands of Arthur Schopenhauer, he read it, and by patience and perseverance, understood something of it through its Perso-Latin disguise. He was still a young man, Kant had till then been his prophet, and like many others were then, and still are now, he was filled with the idea of a deep wisdom to be revealed to the modern world by the ancient literature of India. The Upanishads impressed him deeply, and gave a tone to much of his philosophy, though ultimately, and the fact is an interesting one, its practical outcome was much more like Buddhism than Brahmanism. Professor Max Müller quotes largely from Schopenhauer's praises of the Upanishad, and considers the passages he cites "highly important for a true appreciation of the philosophical value of them." We must say that the spectacle of Schopenhauer giving all his youthful energy and enthusiasm to the weary study of the Oupnek'hat, making it his gospel, and weaving it into his philosophy, is to us a very sad one. He wrote of it in terms of exaggerated, but no doubt honest, panegyric :

How entirely does the Oupnek'hat breathe throughout the holy spirit of the Vedas! How is every one who by a diligent study of its Persian-Latin has become familiar with that incomparable book, stirred by that spirit to the very depth of his soul! How does every line display its firm, definite, and throughout harmonious meaning! From every sentence deep, original, and sublime thoughts arise, and the whole is pervaded by a high and holy earnest spirit. Indian air surrounds us, and original thoughts of kindred spirits. And oh, how thoroughly is the mind here washed clear of all early engrafted Jewish superstitions, and of all philosophy that cringes before these superstitions! In the whole world there is no study except that of the originals so beneficial

Sam Beid, cum voce altâ, cum harmoniâ pronunciatum fiat. Adkith porro cremor (optimum, selectissimum) est : quemadmodum ex (præ) omni quieto (non moto) et moto, pulvis (terra) cremor (optimum) est : et e (præ) terra aqua cremor est : et ex aqua comedendum (victus) cremor est : (et) e comedendo comedens cremor est : et e comedente loquela (id quod dicitur) cremor est : et e loquela, aiet ॠ Beid, et ex aiet ॠ sîam, id est cum harmoniâ (pronunciatum) : et e Sam, ॠ adkit, cremor est : id est oum, &c.

ever, of Om is this. The essence* of all beings is the earth, the essence of the earth is water, the essence of water the plants, the essence of plants man, the essence of speech the Rig-Veda, the essence of the Rig-Veda the Sâma-Veda, the essence of the Sâma-Veda the Udgitha (which is Om).

* Essence is explained to mean end, object, that which is produced as the best result from a thing.

and so elevating as that of the Oupnek'hat. It has been the solace of life, it will be the solace of my death!¹²

And again :

In most of the pagan philosophical writers of the first Christian centuries we see the Jewish theism, which, as Christianity, was soon to become the faith of the people, shining through, much as at present we may perceive shining through, in the writings of the learned, the native pantheism of India, which is destined sooner or later to become the faith of the people, *ex oriente lux*.¹³

Professor Max Müller expresses a hope that what Schopenhauer has said may secure a more considerate reception "for those relics of ancient wisdom," the Upanishads, than anything he could say in their favour. Schopenhauer's words are useful in this respect, that they call attention to a fact that might not be otherwise so obvious at the very outset, that there is a school of modern thought which, being implicitly or explicitly pantheistic, sets a high value on an ancient literature which can be held up as an early possession of our race, and made into a kind of gospel of pantheism. That this was Schopenhauer's motive for his love of the Upanishads is perfectly clear from the animus of his remarks.¹⁴ To our minds, the Upanishads derive a far higher interest and value from the fact that they are even at the present day the Veda of the more educated classes of the Hindus, that such bodies as the theistic Brahmo-Samāj hold them in reverence, and that for centuries they have coloured Indian thought. Of course their bearing on the development of what is called "modern" (?) thought are not to be left out of sight, but it would be to distort our whole view of the Upanishads to consider first their anticipation of modern European pantheism.

Professor Max Müller has himself spoken very highly of the Upanishads, and has given us the key to the history of his affection for them when he says :

My real love for Sanskrit literature was first kindled by the Upanishads. It was in the year 1844, when attending Schelling's lectures at

¹² Schopenhauer, Parerga, apud M. M. Introd. to Upanishads, p. lxi.

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ Take for instance the following : " In India our religion will never strike root : the primitive wisdom of the human race will never be pushed aside there by the events of Galilee. On the contrary, Indian wisdom will flow back upon Europe and produce a thorough change in our knowing and thinking " (Schopenhauer, *Last Days*, p. 11).

Berlin, that my attention was drawn to these ancient theosophic treatises, and I still possess my collection of the Sanskrit MSS., which had then just arrived at Berlin, the Chambers collection, and my copies of commentaries and commentaries on commentaries which I made at the time. Some of my translations, which I left with Schelling, I have never been able to recover.¹⁵

Schelling, if we are not mistaken, was lecturing on his theories of mythology and revelation, and, if we may speak of his system on the authority of German critics as free from theological bias as himself, it is a pantheistic one, with something of the Indian theory of the identity of all things very prominent in it. Thus it was philosophy that first led Professor Max Müller to the Upanishads, and he studied them in a congenial atmosphere. For thirty years, he tells us, that study was laid aside; he adds that when he lately resumed it, it was with an interest changed in character but undiminished. The study has certainly given a very marked tone to some of his most recent productions.

In his Hibbert Lectures, Professor Max Müller represented Indian religious thought as developing first a tendency towards monotheism, and then a tendency to atheism in the age between the composition of the Vedic hymns and that of the earliest of the Upanishads. It seemed, he said, as if Indian religion, after trying in vain to grow into an organized polytheism on the one hand, or an exclusive monotheism on the other, was about to end in atheism, or the denial of all the gods, or Devas. And so it did, he tells us. We are rapidly sketching an outline of his theory, not discussing it, but we may remark in passing that this early Indian atheism seems to us a very doubtful element in the whole system. But the Professor explains that this atheism was not a vulgar, but an honest atheism :

They forsook the bright Devas, not because they believed or desired less, but because they believed and desired more than the bright Devas. There was a new conception working in their mind : and the cries of despair were but the harbingers of a new birth. So it has been ; so it always will be. There is an atheism which is unto death ; there is another atheism which is the very life-blood of all true faith. It is the power of giving up what in our best, our most honest moments, we know to be no longer true : it is the readiness to replace the less perfect, however dear, however sacred it may be to us, by the more perfect, however much it may be detested, as yet, by the world.¹⁶

¹⁵ *Sacred Books*, i, p. lxx. ¹⁶ *Hibbert Lectures*, 1878, p. 304.

This new birth was the philosophy of the Upanishads. Professor Max Müller introduced it in his last lecture in words that were more like those of the poet than a philosopher, words too which, for reasons that we shall develop later on, seem to us to be very misleading. He reminded his hearers that when the old gods of Greeks, Romans, and Germans disappeared, it was to make way for Christianity, but that "in India there was no such religion coming, as it were, from outside, in which the Brahmins, after they had left their old gods and protectors, could have taken refuge." This is said to heighten the effect of the alleged evolution of a new faith in India. He goes on :

They [the Brahmins] threw away the old names, but they did not throw away their belief in that which they had tried to name. After destroying the altars of their old gods, they built out of the scattered bricks a new altar to the Unknown God—unknown, unnamed and yet omnipresent : seen no more in the mountains and rivers, in the sky and the sun, in the rain and the thunder, but present even then, and it may be nearer to them, and encircling them, no longer like Varuṇa, the encircling and all-embracing ether, but more closely and more intimately, being, as they called it themselves, the very ether in their heart ; it may be, the still small voice.¹⁷

This new conception was that of the Ātman or "self," the principle of existence in each living man and identical with the Ātman or all-pervading "self" of the universe, which was but another name for Brahma, the impersonal soul of all things, the only truth ; so true that all else was but illusion (Māya). We quote again from Professor Max Müller. He thus strikes the key-note of the Upanishads :

There is not what could be called a philosophical system in these Upanishads. They are, in the true sense of the word, guesses at truth, frequently contradicting each other, yet all tending in one direction. The key-note of the old Upanishads is "know thyself," but with a much deeper meaning than that of the *Γνῶθι σεαυτόν* of the Delphic Oracle. The "know thyself" of the Upanishads means, know thy true self, that which underlies thine Ego, and find it and know it in the highest, the eternal Self, the One without a second, which underlies the whole world. This was the final solution of the search after the Infinite, the Invisible, the Unknown, the Divine, a search begun in the simplest hymns of the Veda, and ended in the Upanishads, or, as they were afterwards called, the Vedānta, the end or the highest object of the Veda. I can do no more than read you some extracts from those works, which stand unrivalled in the literature of India, nay, in the literature of the world.¹⁸

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 311.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 317, 318.

Before discussing this theory, it will be well to examine one of the Upanishads from which these extracts were taken, with a view to seeing how far this last bold statement is at all justified by facts. The extracts which Professor Max Müller read in his last lecture would not, we believe, even taken by themselves, impress us very much with either the beauty or the value of the Upanishads, and judging by the full texts of those Upanishads that are included in the present volume, we must say, after no hasty or perfunctory study of the *Khândogya* and those that follow it, that the extracts are far above the average of the books taken as a whole. The Professor selects from the Upanishads certain striking passages; he places these in the poetical and somewhat imaginative setting of which we have already given some examples, and thus attempts to justify his high estimate of those treatises and his assertion that they stand unrivalled in the literature of the world. This proceeding is hardly less misleading than that of one of the critics of the present volume, who, writing in one of the leading journals of criticism, showed a total want of appreciation of the relation of the Upanishads to the thought of India and the world, confessed that he had read them without being able to do more than laugh at them, and ended by giving one of the most absurd and inane passages of the *Khândogya* as a sample of the whole, and suggests that perhaps Schopenhauer consoled his last moments with it. These are two different poles of criticism. The critic in the weekly paper certainly misled his readers in one direction; we are inclined to think that the Hibbert Lecturer of 1878 misled them as much in the other.

NOTE.—With regard to Sanskrit words we follow in these articles the same system of transliteration that has been adopted by Professor Max Müller in the *Sacred Books of the East*. Most of the letters have their common English sounds; *g* is always hard, *g* soft like *j*; *k* is hard, but *k* represents a soft sound like *ch* in church; the aspiration of a consonant has a peculiar effect on the pronunciation, both the consonant and the aspirate being heard, the result being to emphasize rather than change the pronunciation: the vowels have the full Italian sound.

Before discussing this theory it will be well to examine one of the Unbelievers from which these extracts were taken, with a view to seeing how far this last statement is at all justified by facts. The extracts which I have from Max Müller's treatise in this last lecture would not be believed even taken by themselves.

The Reality of the Sin of Unbelief.

MEN are at least hard enough, as a rule, in judging one of another. They are very far indeed from giving cause of complaint, that the "charity which thinketh no evil" prevents due precautions being taken against the possibilities of human crime. Society deems it necessary, in self-defence, to have strong means of enforcing justice among its own members; and, both in its legislative and its executive departments, it shows a conviction that it has to do with sinners rather than saints. Similarly in private transactions, it is reckoned no insult among strangers, or even among most acquaintances, to stand on guard by the exaction of references, signatures, and securities. There is a sort of common agreement, that men among men, because they are men and not angels confirmed in grace, must give and take pledges of sincerity. Not even the most enthusiastic philanthropist dares preach the doctrine, "Let us all trust one another unconditionally." Of course the spirit of self-protection may be pushed too far, and carried into quarters where it is quite intolerable. But, on the whole, mankind has passed a fair judgment on itself in sanctioning the general propositions, that men need some compulsion, or at least some prospect of compulsion, to hold them to their duty; that most men have their failings; and that a large number of men are out-and-out scoundrels. Nor need we, therefore, give up that most salutary principle of action, never to treat our fellows as rogues, if we can possibly avoid so doing.

Now those same people, who would push the unfavourable view of their race even further than is right, not allowing for the vast amount of good that there is in mankind, nevertheless err sometimes on the side of leniency with respect to just one particular. They can see the wickedness of not *acting* aright, but the wickedness of not *believing* aright, they cannot see. First, they maintain that it cannot make any matter what a man merely *thinks* about God; and, if driven from that position,

they take refuge in the assertion that really all would believe the truth if only they could come to the knowledge of it ; and that failure to reach the knowledge cannot be due to any fault on the inquirer's part. The next admission may be, that certain licentious livers may have reason for wilfully shutting their eyes to the light, but at least there are other agnostics who are blameless. Now the fact is that, as large masses grievously offend in matter of morals, so also do large masses grievously offend in matter of faith. To any one who knows what perfect intellectual honesty is, the proposition will not sound strange, that it is far rarer to find men without reproach as to the inward thoughts towards truth, than it is to find men without reproach as to their outward dealings in the matter of strict uprightness. The excuse, "men would not wilfully refuse their assent to the truth," if understood, not merely of direct rejection, but also of remote frustration, is no more valid than would be the plea, which no one in his sober senses dares to set up in the teeth of facts, "men would not wilfully depart from the conduct which they saw to be for their own best interest." The lamentable truth is, that great is the perversity of the sinner, whatever may be the *a priori* incredibility of the fact. *A priori*, it was not likely that the angels, or our first parents, would sin ; but they were free to sin, and they did sin. In faith as well as in morals sin abounds. Let no Christian yield to the soft persuasion, that the crime of disbelief or of misbelief does not exist. It is a great and sad reality. To deny it is a vain attempt to save man's honour at the expense of God's honour.

Yet this is to be noted in explanation of apparent difficulty. The sin of unbelief is subtle and may easily escape clear abiding detection, as distinguished from occasional glimpses, in the self-blinding conscience. The grosser, fleshly crimes are in some sense acknowledged by the culprit. He is plainly, in the open light, a wallower in filth, and he has to see as much himself. Not that he is wholly without his self-excusing ; he may have large store of these ; but the self-excusing cannot silence the voice of his self-accusing. The intellect, however, in sins specially intellectual, can hardly remain in fully admitted rebellion against the truth. It cannot make lies, as lies, the substance of its daily food. It has to disguise itself from itself, or the violence to nature would be too strong. It suppresses inquiry, looks away from what it

does not want to see, and sees through a microscope, or through coloured glasses, what it wants to see. And so *mentita est iniquitas sibi*.

The most awful examples of blindness wilfully brought on are found in those men, who, once in the possession of the faith have deliberately, though always with some specious pretexts, put out the light that was in them. They most of all are guilty of the sin against the Holy Ghost, which is called resisting the known truth. Of such sort was a man, whom party spirit has succeeded in raising to the rank of a foremost champion of truth, at least in the estimation of those that have lacked either opportunity, or capacity, or will, to form a correct judgment according to the facts of the case. Of course by acquiescing in a large curtailment of the doctrines of original Christianity; by allowing a complete break in the line of legitimate pastors; by setting aside the indefectibility of the Church, as a Church; by confusing the crimes of individuals with their official prerogatives which are not individual, it is possible to get a stand-point from which a very superficial observer may represent Luther's work as one of the noblest ever done by mortal endeavour. Also it is possible to represent the man himself as of highest moral worth, if only his various enormities, his dishonesty, violence, and obscenity, are resolutely ignored, though patent as noonday. But the truth is, we ought to distinguish between faults and faults. There are some faults, which, because they are either only occasional, or not radically vitiating, leave a man's character, on the whole, good. But there are others which simply force us to pronounce the man, as a man, bad, whatever palliating traits he may have. Now with Luther we are not further concerned than to ask, was his reform, on a full view of the case, a piece of honest or of dishonest work? For the purpose of answering this question it will be needful to speak of Luther's character in general, but not at much length. Certainly it is not needful,—as is often done, and not always without utility however,—to gather up a volume of the heresiarch's scurrilities, and hurl them at his head. It will be quite enough to regard his conduct on a few broad principles, a task which the monstrosity of the character makes somewhat difficult.

And first it will be well to hear the opinion of an admirer, who, acknowledging grave faults, yet does not think these so substantial as to prevent him from pronouncing the verdict greatly in Luther's favour. The failings are represented as

accidental to the character, the virtues as forming the essence, and therefore as giving it the denomination of good in the main.

It is half-amusing to hear Hagenbach, after a most roseate account of Luther's career, thus take into account, at the end, what ought to have entered into the warp and woof of his narrative; and changed its whole texture. "Ask Luther whether he would have applied to himself the predicate of *the Wise*, bestowed by history upon his gracious elector. If the wise man be distinguished by a judicious moderation in all things, by a clever calculation of the means whereby he endeavours to attain his purpose, by a uniform morality that might serve as a rule of conduct for others, no person will think of classing Luther with the wise men presented to our view in Hellenic antiquity or modern history. Luther said, and did, and wrote many things that might perplex a wise man. His speech and action were anything but in all points morally correct. He gave himself much liberty in jest and earnest, and in neither department will his words bear to be weighed by the goldsmith's scales. He is far removed from the perfectness of that man who offends in no word. Though many of his expressions, which are displeasing to our ears, cannot be condemned as immoral, yet they strike us as in a high degree unmannerly, unchaste, and rude. Whenever Luther is carried away by passion, the unmannerliness of which we speak actually lapses into immorality, in as much as a want of moderation constitutes a transgression of the bounds of morality." These admissions, which are far below the truth, do not prevent the author from declaring that Luther was "thoroughly pure-minded." "Far be it from us, however, to worship Luther. To him, as to other great men, the proverb is applicable, which declares God has taken care that the trees shall not grow up to the sky. There are many shades as well as lights in his character, and the same quality that on some occasions seems to be a virtue, at other times assumes the aspect of a weakness." Then in a note some instances of "polarity of character," that is of gross inconsistency, are given; as for example, "he broke with history and expressed himself contemptuously in regard to the Fathers of the Church, and yet took his stand upon ecclesiastical tradition. With his full faith in Christ he set himself above the Scripture, and nevertheless issued the command to throttle reason." Minor inconsistencies may not detract from the general sincerity of a man, but even an

admirer ought to see that constant and fundamental inconsistency of character is more than an accidental blemish; and that the following is no sufficient summing up of the case:¹ "On serious reflexion we may well be conscious of a feeling of sadness that the high and glorious nature of the man contains elements which are so contradictory, and which his ill-wishers can so readily combine into a caricature." Even his well-wishers, if they are candid, are bound to conclude, that a character essentially self-contradictory is essentially bad.

So history is written by a blind eulogist, who fails to see the force of his own admissions. Let us bring his judgment to the test of facts. The briefest way will be rapidly to launch Luther on his course of Reformer, and then, watching his track, to see whether it keeps to "the straight forth right," or is wholly devious, tortuous, leading to no harbour of salvation, but only to wreckage most inexcusable. Luther was at first a fervent monk, but his character was just the one to make perspicacious superiors alarmed. He was so flighty, so given to extremes, so far from having that masterful self-command which alone renders virtue steady. Two great impulses he had, to which afterwards he quite yielded himself; they were the great agents in destroying his old belief and forming his new—as far, indeed, as so chameleon-like a teacher can be said ever to have held any second belief in place of the one he had cast off. The two master passions were pride of the intellect and lust of the flesh. Early indications of the former, not to be obscured by parallel indications of a timid, retiring habit, are found in the constant assignment of the humiliating offices of the convent to Luther, while the latter disposition is thus mentioned by himself: "*Carnis meæ indomitæ uror magnis ignibus et libidine.*" These two principles, destructive of true faith, we must now trace successively in their action, taking it for already granted that pride and sensuality are capable of undermining the virtue of faith. There is no need for proof of this hypothesis.

After much vacillation at first, after onslaughts on the Papal authority, followed by declarations of loyalty or by petitions for better instruction—in fine, after much double dealing, Luther at length found himself fully committed to the leadership of a

¹ A rationalist, whose labours are no obstacle to seeing the full extent of Luther's wildness, has solved the enigma of the Reformer's character by pronouncing him simply mad on certain points. This judgment at least may serve to show how grave are the facts that stand out against the ordinary Protestant opinion, which is propagated only on the principle of blind admiration of a leader.

revolt against Rome. For reasons confessed by the Reformers themselves, namely, because the new creed gratified the passions of princes and people, already very corrupt, the doctrines of Luther spread like wild-fire. He was triumphant, and yet not so. For he was filled with dismay at his own work. He tells us himself that he could wish the deed undone; that, had he foreseen the consequences, he would have stood back from the enterprise, and that he wished death had taken him away in childhood. And why was he thus alarmed at his own success? Because, as he and numerous colleagues of his testify, a frightful increase of crime, abundant enough before, but now something appalling, followed on the loosening of the bonds which hitherto had somewhat restrained the Christian commonwealth. He is ever recurring to the fact that things were better, morally, under the Papacy. And the fact is not one that can at all be doubted. Döllinger has collected superabundant testimony on the matter, given, as he says, by the very people whose interest it was not to calumniate their own sect. Ministers and people were alike sunk in degradation. Of the former, Luther says that they were able enough to decry the Pope, but could neither defend nor understand doctrines of their own. He laments their want of discipline, their chaotic state, their endless disputes among themselves; and, as a remedy for so much disorder, he suggests establishing an ecclesiastical prison. Out of two thousand theological students, he computes, in his fit of desperation, that two or three good ministers may be got. This is his general tone about the clergy, though, on occasion, when it suits his fancy, he can say: "Everywhere our pastors, thank God, are faithful and well instructed." Then as to the people, his complaint is that they hold their ministers in contempt, leave them to starve, and, as for getting good from sermons, "the opposite of the Ten Commandments might just as well be preached." He reckons that everybody is seven times as bad as under the Papacy, the demon expelled having returned with seven others more wicked than himself. Thus Luther shuddered at his own children, but pride would not let him abandon what he had so defiantly begun. And now it has to be seen how pride conflicted with the known truth. As Luther was not satisfied with his followers, neither with himself was he satisfied. He admits that he had not inwardly the conviction about his own doctrines which outwardly he may seem to have had. But he seeks fictitious support in a notion impious in the extreme,

and itself a new reason for remorse—that St. Paul was similarly sceptical about what he taught, and, in allusion to these misgivings said, “I die daily.” Luther doubts his own mission, and the perplexity makes him veer about like the wind. At one time he holds that he has been sent direct by God; at another time, that all pretence to direct legation is blasphemy, but that the Wittenberg authorities are sufficient warrant for his action; and, once again, that no mission whatever is necessary.² Still remorse seizes him for his rebellion. “Oh, how many painful efforts it has cost me, even when I rested on Scripture, to justify myself in conscience for having dared to rise up against the Pope, to regard him as Antichrist and the bishops as the apostles of Antichrist, and the Universities as houses of prostitution! How often has my heart failed me before that argument of theirs—‘Are you alone wise? What if you are in error, and dragging so many people down with you into perdition for ever?’”³ Again he says: “The devil torments me, upbraiding me with the words—‘What multitudes have you led astray with your teaching!’ I have not a greater or more violent temptation than because of my sermons, saying within myself, ‘You are the author of all these scandals.’” These were salutary stings of conscience, but he had not the humility to follow their better promptings. On the contrary, he seeks escape in the sorriest of refuges. He glories in imagining the Pope as bad as himself. “After Jesus Christ the abomination of the Pope is my greatest consolation.” Not, however, an effectual consolation. The torture is constantly making itself felt, till it wrings out the sad confession, “I have nearly quite lost Christ, and am tossed about by the waves of despair and of blasphemy against God.” “I cannot escape from the thought that I would rather not have undertaken the work of the Reform.” The light of the pure Gospel, he fancies, ought to have been kept to himself and to a few very choice souls: it clearly did nothing but harm among mankind at large.

There is one method used by Luther falsely to allay his troubled conscience, which deserves fuller notice. The devil plays a double part with the Reformer, now as helpful, now as harmful. The help may be direct, as when Satan is represented as teaching valid arguments against the Mass; or it may be

² Hergenröther traces out historically Luther's swayings to and fro, on this side and on that, between these several views of his own position.

³ Nearly all the quotations used in this paper may be found, with references, in Döllinger's *Reformation*.

indirect, as when the opposition called forth proves the best school of knowledge. "Cur sacramentarii Scripturam non intelligant hæc causa est, quia verum opponentem, nempe diabolum, non habent, qui demum docere eos solet. Quando diabolum hujusmodi collo non habemus affixum nihil nisi speculativi theologi sumus." To the devil, as harmful, he attributes all those stings of remorse which have just been exemplified, under pressure of which hauntings he devised a means of falsifying his conscience by calling its real reproaches mere temptations. Moreover, he had a further theory about temptation, which still more blinded his perception of right and wrong. Wild as the extravagance may seem, he more than once declares that the suggestions of the devil must be met by a spontaneous plunge in some other direction, even though it be unto what is sinful.⁴ Nay, he wishes that he could discover some new sin wherewith to elude the devil's solicitations. "Est nonnunquam largius bibendum, ludendum, nugandum, atque adeo peccatum aliquod faciendum in odium et contemptum diaboli." The illustrations, for decency's sake, are omitted. "Alioquin vincimur si nimis anxii curaverimus ne quid peccemus. Proinde si quando dixerit diabolus, tu sic fac, illi responde; atque ob eam causam maxime bibam atque adeo largius in nomine Christi bibam." "Away with the decalogue," he says in another place, "when Satan has to be opposed." It is easy to see that a doctrine of this sort is not honest, it is wholly against reason.

And indeed Luther, seeing that reason was thus entirely opposed to him, set to work at its destruction. He calls it the "bride of Satan," "an accursed whore," to be "pelted with ordure, and cast into the receptacle of ordure." The Universities were an object of his abhorrence, because seats of learning, and he attacks the Sorbonne for teaching that what is true in theology cannot be false in philosophy.⁵ Philosophy he is ever denouncing, especially under the representative names of Aristotle, St. Thomas, and the "Thomistic pigs."⁶ Occasionally

⁴ The only admission that Hagenbach finds it convenient to make on this head is the following: "Luther did not hesitate to snap his fingers [at temptations of the devil], by indulging in a mirthfulness that was sometimes extravagant." Two mild specimens are quoted, and some of the more disgraceful examples are indicated by references, which may be relied on for not generally being made.

⁵ Admirer Hagenbach says: "If the name of philosopher had been applied to him he would have protested against it. We know in what estimation he held the 'old storm-brewer,' Reason, and her priestess, Philosophy, and what opinion he entertained of that master of thought, Aristotle."

he seems to impugn the validity of reason even as to truths of this world; but at other times he finds it more prudent to confine the invalidity to truths of the next world, which he hands over to the faculty of faith. And a most marvellous faculty this is, apparently quite a recent gift to mankind. Hitherto "all truths have been suppressed or obscured by these asses, the Popes;" "from St. Peter downwards no Pope has taught the Gospel." Hence Popes and Councils must submit to be taught by a child who has faith. In one place the age of competency to teach the whole clergy is given: boys and girls of fifteen are qualified. Ministers are exhorted to submit their doctrines to the correction of the people. Yet, with his usual inconsistency, Luther elsewhere upbraids the insolence of the people, which led them to stay away from church, on the plea of being quite able to expound Scripture for themselves. But their worst offence of all was, that some seemed to put themselves on an equality "with Dr. Martin himself." Despising all scientific theology, and really producing not even scholarly exegetical works on Scripture itself, the early Reformed Church was without any stability in its positive teachings, and fell back upon an idea of faith which was simply absurd.

Luther often changed his view as to what faith was, especially in its relation to works. At times, he taught the very opposite of what is widely in favour now. His view on these occasions was, that it mattered less what a man did than what he believed. "Domine Deus, obsecro te pro inexhausta bonitate, dignare nos potius nulla non peccatorum sentina immersos labi multifariam, si peccandum nobis est; tantum nos a cæcitate, et amentia et a compunctionis spiritu tutos retine." A false notion of the power of faith was one of the earliest of Luther's delusions. It brought him consolation during the trials of his monastic life, and afterwards, when twisted into ever varying shapes, it gave ground to many of his extravagances. But what is most to the present point is how, killing out the very notions of truthfulness in Luther, it led him on and ever on in his career of sinful unbelief. He became the mere creature of impulse, so as to say what the heat of the moment prompted, quite regardless of what he might utter or had uttered under pressure of other circumstances. He was simply one of those men of whom we might say, what it is a very hard thing indeed to say, and what ought not to

be said without evident justification, namely, that scarce any utterance from his mouth would create surprise in those who knew him, because they knew him. His self-contradictions are simply a maze, baffling all description or clue. The *Lutherus Septiceps* is a book which attempts some sort of analysis; and it gives, with references, thirty-seven contradictions on the subject of the Eucharist alone; a matter where Luther confesses his own specially flagrant dishonesty. He tells that he would fain have found out an argument against the Real Presence; that he tried to the utmost of his endeavour, but that the words of Scripture were too clear for him. And his object all along he declares to have been the finding of something that should give trouble to the Pope. These facts he tells us, as complacently as if articles of faith, were tools to be used anyhow, and to be re-shaped, if possible, to serve for the accomplishment of unworthy ends. Is it any wonder, then, that Luther, thus disregardful of truth, should present us with a mass of contradictions; leaving the Catholic Church ostensibly for the crimes and abuses of its members—or at least for these in great measure—and denying, in the case of his own sect, that crimes and abuses were an argument against a system; condemning in other leaders of revolt precisely those licences which he arrogated to himself; telling the Papal agents that he could never retract, and threatening his unruly followers to punish them with a retraction of all he had ever taught: "Non dubitabo omnia quæ aut scripsi aut docui palinodiam canere, et a vobis desciscere; hoc vobis dictum esto;" declaring that no man has authority to impose a belief on his fellows, and then dictatorially settling points, which he could not prove, with the words: "I, Martin Luther, so will and ordain;" violently assailing Henry the Eighth of England, then most abjectly craving pardon and offering to recant; and once more returning to the charge with screams of "ass," "pig," "rake," and other such Lutheran terms. Luther, of course, had to half-delude himself with a fancied zeal for truth: many passages could be gathered from his works seeming to breathe the noblest love of that object. But underneath these pretensions a radical falsity is clearly detected by all whose prepossessions do not blind their powers of observation. There are two weaknesses to which the bodily eye is occasionally found subject. One is the inability to see the presence of an object because of a nervously excited desire to see it; another is the illusory perception of

an object not present, because of a similar nervous excitement. The mental eye has often its blindness to what is present, and its illusory sight of what is not present; only in its case the perturbing cause is not in both instances a desire to see, but in the first instance a desire not to see. Under such a weakness has Luther's life frequently been written.

The second passion which urged Luther on in his criminal misbelief may be shortly dismissed. If the Table Talk is really Luther speaking *ex abundantia cordis*, over his cups, then he stands condemned of grossly impure conversation, such as would now-a-days exclude him from any society with a shadow of a pretence to be decent. Moreover, the unblushing way in which he preached to the people against the Gospel of Christ, that marriage, except for an exceedingly few cases, was a necessity of nature, details being gone into without reserve, showed the grossness of the man, and produced a grossness in the people that was most lamentable. It is quite impossible here to transcribe passages. To Luther's words his conduct was in many ways quite answerable. Only partisanship can speak of his marriage as a decorous proceeding. The two exceptions which he publicly announced as mitigating the strictness of the marriage vow, sanctioned a frequent practice of infidelity in a contract which admits of no such licences. Moreover, the Reformers soon began to allow divorce on various pretences. Luther himself, as Bossuet long ago made publicly known, granted the privilege of bigamy to a prince who wanted the heresiarch's signature for the scandal. And under no such royal pressure Luther once expressed the sentiment, in a reckless fit, that concubinage, though hideous before men, might be a marriage in the sight of God. Is there any wonder that a heart so unclean as this, so deliberately guilty of falsehood in the interests of uncleanness, should be false too in his other doctrines? To the clean of heart is promised the sight of God, as well the perfect sight in the world to come, as that obscurer sight which is had by faith in this life. Luther most grossly violated the condition, and in consequence his vision of God was darkened—darkened here, and who shall say whether wholly put out hereafter? He renounced the friendship of his Maker, and was constantly losing friends that he had gathered round him on earth. Some of his chosen intimates abandoned and denounced him. Even his pet place, Wittenberg, became so abominable to him that,

unless prevented by the Elector, he would have fled from it, saying: "Far, far from me be this Sodom." A profound melancholy weighed upon him, and to the prospect of the end of the world being at hand, he said: "Amen, fiat, amen." A like melancholy hung over several other of the leading Reformers, whose death was hastened or caused by their depression of spirits. Döllinger has collected a long list of these sad endings. Their one voice is, that their co-religionists, if the term may be pardoned, are so unbearably wicked. The Germans, according to Luther, are "filthy pigs," "a barbarous and brutish nation," "half-demons." Such was the outcome of Luther's regeneration of Christianity. He is a hero to those only whose test of heroism is the doing of bold things, no matter what these are, or how done. He must soon share the fate of our English Reformers, who used to be glorified as the noblest of characters. For three hundred years the nation had deliberately falsified its own history; but now the time has come for the great national lie to be upset;⁶ and not many sane men, who read the materials put at their disposal, retain to-day the traditional fiction about "glorious Elizabeth" and her creatures. When Luther shall have suffered similar exposure in this country, the cause of faith will be avenged; and a glaring instance will show how misbelief comes of sin and is itself a sin.

A second instance of the manner in which the sin against faith works itself out is found in the Jewish people. They expected a Messiah Who would bring them earthly power, splendour of Court, glory among nations, abundance of oil, corn, wine, and other such objects of temporal well-being. They looked to receive the blessings the same in kind, but magnified in degree, which their fathers had enjoyed in the Promised Land. But Christ came poor in things of this world, and in spite of the sufficient signs He gave them of His Divinity, they would not accept Him on His own terms. They were not going to change their preconceived ideas, not even when Christ warned them of the thickening darkness that was upon them: "Yet a little while the light is among you. Walk whilst you have the light, that the darkness overtake you not. . . . Whilst you have

⁶ What will come of the re-writing of the origins of Anglicanism is a speculation. Some of its clear-sighted authorities were from the beginning opposed to the publication of the old records, because these would turn the thoughts of the people to Popery. Such is and will be the effect on many; many, too, are drifting and will drift into infidelity at the overturning of their old views.

the light believe the light, that you may be the children of light. . . . And whereas He had done so many miracles among them, they believed not in Him."⁷ In the wide disparity between what they looked for and what they found, they formed to themselves such justification of their unbelief as all unbelievers must find somewhere or other. Yet we have Christ's word for it, that "they were inexcusable." Men, with misapplied compassion, may invent excuses for them, but Christ's verdict gives us the real state of the case. Faith is acceptance under a certain degree of difficulty; and this difficulty a self-willed people would not surmount. The same obstinacy with which they met Christ they afterwards continued towards the Apostles. Thus on one occasion we read: "The Gentiles, hearing, were glad, and glorified the word of the Lord. . . . But the Jews stirred up religious and honourable women and the chief men of the city, and raised persecution against Paul and Barnabas, and cast them out of their city."⁸ The rejected Apostles, obeying the word of their Master, retired, shaking the dust from their feet. For God does not compel the acceptance of His gifts; He requires a certain effort of free cooperation, and especially an effort against proud self-sufficiency of intellect. Another example is given: "Paul was earnest in preaching, testifying to the Jews that Jesus is the Christ. But they gainsaying and blaspheming, he shook his garments, and said to them: Your blood be upon your heads; I am clean; from henceforth I will go unto the Gentiles."⁹ Thus St. Paul was not weakly tolerant of unbelief in the sight of sufficient evidence. But he said sternly, "Your blood be upon your heads;" and so saying, he left them to their own perversity, not hard-heartedly, not in anger on his own account, rather with infinite compassion; but all the same he washed his hands of them and left them to their obduracy.

But there is a third class of those who sin against faith, and their case is harder of explanation. They never had the full faith like Luther, and they were never called upon, like the Jews, to make the comparatively easy, natural transition from the Old Dispensation to the New. Often they had to start with no better creed than a gloomy, irrational, and impious Calvinism, or else no religion at all. Instances of both these cases are to be found in recent biographies. Moreover, it must be allowed that the lives of some unbelievers have not presented

⁷ St. John xii. 35—39.

⁸ Acts xiii. 58—60.

⁹ Acts xviii. 6.

that open immorality which, in the instance of Voltaire and his like, has been reason enough why they should wish there should be no Christianity; though, at the same time, it must also be added, that certain unbelievers, much praised for their fine characters, have had great blots on their conduct, though biographers could hardly bring these out in full magnitude. Hence an observable reticence in the narratives. Still, these moral failings apart, the problem has to be faced, how possibly can men and women with many natural virtues yet be at fault in their refusal to believe what is sufficiently within the range of their faculties, and what they are bound to accept with mind and heart? The answer contains various points. But these must be given rather suggestively than exhaustively.

First, it is to be noted that there may be a conflict between virtues. To God alone it belongs, by nature, to have no such antagonism. Now it sometimes happens that the most admired of the natural virtues, by not taking their due place in the general harmony, may stand in the way of some of the most important Christian virtues. The contrast has often been drawn between the magnanimous and what may be called the submissive or subjectionary virtues. The former largely compose the the code of honour: about which one of the most noted preachers of the honour-system has admitted that it is not all-sufficient; and the after-career of many of his disciples has proved the truth of his words: "What is not vicious," says Dr. Arnold, of Rugby, "may be *sinful*; in other words, what is not a grave offence against men's common notions of right and wrong may yet be a *very great* one against those purer motives which we learn from the Scripture, and in the judgment of the most pure God." For instance, there are countries where a gentleman would rather feel proud than ashamed of having killed his man in a duel, or of having successfully carried on a piece of very criminal gallantry, whilst he would be ashamed to have it said of him, that, on a single occasion, to an enemy who smote one cheek he calmly presented the other. Even an averagely good Christian might blush to own that he practised bodily mortification. For such things are rather in contempt than in esteem with the world. "Let humility," says Helvetius, "be held in veneration by a convent: it favours the meanness and idleness of a monastic life. But ought this humility to be the virtue of a people? . . . Pride, it will be said, attaches a man to the earth. So much the better: pride is

therefore useful. The ancient legislators, convinced of the utility of the passions, had no desire to stifle them." God might, had He willed, have required of man fewer exercises of humble subjection, and especially of humble subjection of the intellect, than in the present Order of Providence He does require. But God is Master, and had a right to appoint the way that best pleased Him. He has appointed the way which the whole of Scripture, the teaching of all Christian Doctors, the lives of all the Saints, the life of Sanctity itself incarnate, of Christ Jesus, point out to those who will open their eyes to see. "Unless you become as little children, you shall not enter into the kingdom of Heaven." If rationalists could only be got to change their stand-point, giving up the notion that it is a matter of high honour to hold out against God, till He be reduced to the manifestation of His will without shadow of obscurity, or of difficulty in the execution; then quite a new realm of truth would open before their gaze, and they would perceive that not Marcus Aurelius, but Jesus of Nazareth, apparently the most abject of men, was the true type for their imitation. The ordinarily appointed road for arriving at religious truth is, under the present dispensation, not through Theism to Christianity, but straightforward to Christianity itself. The natural means of seeing God in His works, though abundantly sufficient, are not as practically efficacious as they might be in an order, where they were intended to be the usual sources of information. If, however, it is urged that Christianity itself does not carry conviction, then the reply is, that this comes about just for the same cause that was at work among the Jews,—a culpable hardness of heart and blindness of intellect, both of which are traceable to pride, the first fountain of all obstinacy.

In the next place there is to be noted the condition of one who is said, by theologians, to be *peccans in causa*. It was the constant doctrine taught by George Eliot, that wrong action begets inevitably further wrong action, till, if the process be not somewhere checked, there is confirmation in a wickedness which daily waxes more wicked. This the novelist taught on necessitarian principles. A like doctrine, but on other principles and saving free will, is to be found in the Church's schools. Each man is responsible for the habitual course of his own mind. But the moral praise or blame often rests rather with the acts that go to form the habit than with the acts that follow the habit. These latter are generally less responsible; at times they may

have got out of the category of present responsibility. There is no need to fall back upon the doctrine of unchangeable obduracy contracted even in this life; it is enough that the power of free choice is considerably hampered in its action for good. He who so puts himself at a disadvantage with regard to the virtues required of him, is said to be *sinning in the cause*, or sinning in that he makes himself, to some degree, incapable of doing his duty. Such is the fault of a large number of unbelievers. By previous acts, done with their faculties in full working order, they have vitiated those faculties, giving them habits that are as a second nature. False principles are established, which are ever leading to false conclusions; and these gathering themselves together form new principles. Thus the evil grows.

Lastly, it does not appear that the inquiry into religious matters is as earnest as might be supposed. No doubt there is a good deal of talk: there is much writing and there is much reading. But how much of this really bears upon the question? Are not endless discussions carried on almost for the sake of discussion? So impractical men bandy about theories of government for their own amusement, without an effort to reduce any of their theories to a working shape. It is enough if matter for a little interesting conversation is found. De Lamennais gives a true picture. "I speak not," he says, "either of poor hand-drudges buried in their work, or of the rich tossed about in the great void of pleasure; I speak of those who, along with highly-educated minds, enjoy the condition of independence. What, think you, occupies habitually their thoughts? The Eternal Being, and His unchangeable laws? Nothing of the sort. They spend their lives in forming combinations of words, in studying the relations of numbers or the properties of matter; their strong intellects need no objects beyond these to content them. Why speak of God to this man of science, who has filled the world with the noise of his name? How can you wish him to listen to you? Do you not see that now his attention is wholly engrossed with decomposing a salt which hitherto had baffled analysis? Wait till he has made known to the universe a new acid. Then, perhaps, you may be allowed to speak to him of the Infinite Creator, Who formed all things, as it were, for a pastime. That other gentleman is writing a history, or a poem, or a play, or a novel, on which he fancies that his own glory is staked. Do not

bother him; he needs to make use of all his time; for death is coming on apace, and what a pity if it should be upon him before he has put the last crown to his reputation! It is true that his own nature is a secret to him, as are his place in the scale of beings, his future destiny, what he has to hope, and what to fear. He is ignorant whether there be a God, a religion, a Heaven, a Hell. But towards all these matters he has long ago chosen his attitude; he gives himself no thought or trouble about them. This point is not clear, he says to himself; and thereupon he acts as though it were clear that the point is of no consequence. If Hell were to be escaped by bestowing no attention on it, I could see a reason for this portentous unconcern; but to bestow no attention on Hell is the surest road to fall into its jaws." So speaks the *Essay on Indifferentism* about the theme with which it has to deal. In the description many may recognize the portrait of those who say that they are agnostics because, having searched, they found nothing. Let them search again, and better this time.

The above are three partial causes of want of faith in the minds of those, whom no open gross vice condemns of being infidels in godless action first, and in intellect afterwards. Perhaps their culpability is mainly or entirely in the higher regions of thought and will, not in low sensuality. Of course it is not likely that they themselves will at once accept the offered explanation of their state, even as part of the truth; but if they honestly ponder the case they may gradually begin to see more than they suspected. At any rate, those who from the fold of the faith look on at the phenomena of unbelief, will recognize the correctness of the principles that have been laid down in this paper. These principles it is well to bear clearly in mind, lest an excessive spirit of toleration lead Christians to say that, for the most part, even utter want of faith is inculpable ignorance. Unlimited toleration is as logical as can be on the admission that no religion is demonstrably true; but, on the opposite admission, it is quite illogical to make unbelief excusable. The sin of unbelief is a reality, and its prevalence is very wide.

JOHN RICKABY.

Catholic Review.

NOTES ON THE PRESS.

THE DEFENCE OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

IT is not unnatural that, in times of political strain, such as the few weeks towards the close of the late Session of Parliament, when it was thought that a direct collision between the two Houses of Parliament might be brought on by the action of the majority of the Peers, voices should have been raised among the more impatient of the democratic party throughout the country, calling for the reform or abolition of the hereditary Chamber. This is not unnatural, for the reason that democratic ideas have made very considerable progress in the country in the last few decades. This progress is the inevitable result partly of the extension of the franchise and of the levelling effects of the modern educational movement, partly of other causes. That the franchise should be extended to the utmost, and that education should be within the reach of every man, woman, and child in the kingdom, are in themselves very good things, provided always that the education truly deserves the name, and that the classes to whom the franchise is imparted are sensible of their responsibility, and able to wield their power intelligently and loyally. As a matter of fact, the result has in our case been the extension of democratic ideas, though it would probably require an unexampled combination of causes of disturbance to produce any revolutionary outbreak in this country. But, when the ideas of which we speak are largely prevalent, and when people see that an institution so incompatible with these ideas seems to stand in the way of legislation on which the country has made up its mind, it is not wonderful that they should think of assailing the institution itself. All over the modern world there is scarcely anywhere to be found an institution exactly similar to the House of Lords. There are second Chambers enough, and

a cry is occasionally raised for their abolition ; but these second Chambers usually differ from our own, either because they want the hereditary principle altogether, or because their members are, at least in part, either nominated by the Sovereign or elected by the people. In each of these two cases the members of these Chambers have something of the representative character, inasmuch as the nomination by the Sovereign is the nomination by his Ministers, who represent the people, and, as we have said, the members do not transmit their legislative power to their children. It may be fairly said, that no one in the nineteenth century would invent a House of Lords, or introduce such a Chamber where it did not exist. And, when feelings are roused by the resistance of the House of Lords to what seems to be the national will, it is easy to argue that what no one would think of establishing might just as well be done away with.

It may well be the case, as we believe it is, that the cry which has been raised here and there, in consequence of the threatened dead-lock which was happily averted by the prudence both of the Ministry and of the leaders of the majority in the House of Lords, will very soon die away, if it has not already become a thing of the past. Still, the case may and probably will recur again from time to time, and, in the present temper and condition of parties, it is not unlikely that some future political crisis may lead to a sudden revival of the hostility against the House of Lords with so much intensity, as to make its existence a burning question. At present it is not too much to say that a very great disturbance in our political condition might be produced at any time by the imprudence and bad temper of one or two leading men, and that thus the circumstances which might bring this question to the front are almost always imminent. If such circumstances were ever to come about, it would be most important that the true state of the question should be understood, especially by those who form, we may assume, the great majority of the calm thinkers in the country—the men who would look on the destruction of the House of Lords as a great national calamity. And yet, when we turn to some of the defences which have recently been made on behalf of the House of Lords, we do not see any great political wisdom in the line which has been taken by way of apology for an institution which is so integral a part of our Constitution. There may, then, be some

use in setting out what may be fairly said, and what not fairly said, in defence of the Upper Chamber.

It is not wise, certainly, to defend the House of Lords on the simple ground of the usefulness of a second Chamber in a constitutional system in which the legislature is practically omnipotent—we mean, in which the Sovereign has practically abdicated that right of veto which is exercised very freely indeed by the President of the American Republic. The House of Lords is essentially an hereditary Chamber. But a second Chamber need not be hereditary, and, as a matter of fact, the immense majority of second Chambers are not so. The objection to the House of Lords, as we gather it from the lips of those who are most angry with its occasional action, is, not that it is a second Chamber, but that it is a second Chamber which represents nobody but its own class, and which is guided by a continual desire to impede useful legislation, when that legislation conflicts with the interests of its own members. The true defenders of the House of Lords as it is ought to disprove this charge, and until they do so—which they certainly might without difficulty—it is of no pertinence to the question at issue to say that a second Chamber is a very good thing. It may very well be that an hereditary Chamber, recruited—as the House of Lords is constantly recruited—from all classes of the community by the selection of new peers, is a better second Chamber than any other would be the members of which were either elected or nominated for life by the Crown, that is, by the Prime Minister for the time being. This is true, but it is not self-evident. In answer to the argument that an elective or nominated Chamber would put the swamping of the legislature into the hands of the Ministry of the day, the advocates of a second Chamber, not hereditary, might have a good deal to say about the checks which might be contrived against a too numerous creation at any one time of life peers or senators, and the like. Any such objection might also be met by making the peers elective, and by limiting their actual number. But the battle of argument should be fairly fought out between the two sides, and the defenders of the House of Lords as it is, as the best possible second Chamber, should guard themselves against the use of arguments which do not support their cause.

Another argument sometimes adduced in favour of the present second Chamber, is that which rests on the supposed

necessity for the existence of two great parties among us, the party of progress and Reform, and the party of Conservatism. It is said that the House of Lords is the stronghold of Conservatism, and that on that ground it is a most valuable factor in the Constitution. We do not know what the thoughtful men among the Conservatives would say to an argument which implies that the House of Commons is irreclaimably Liberal. But any one can see the extreme unwisdom of making the line of demarcation between the two great parties a line of division between the two branches of the Legislature. This is most unwise on all accounts, and it is particularly unwise from the Conservative point of view. The theory of the Conservative party as to the government of the country—indeed, the theory as to that government of all men of common sense and patriotism—is, that the nation chooses at one time one of the great parties, at another time the other, to guide her policy at home and abroad. The nation chooses the Liberals when it wants changes to be made, and it chooses the Conservatives when it is afraid of change. Both principles have thus their play in turn, though it must be allowed that Governments nominally Liberal are sometimes very illiberal in their measures—witness the Ecclesiastical Titles Act; and that Governments nominally Conservative have often done very Radical things—witness the last Reform Bill of Lord Derby and Mr. Disraeli. But no one can imagine that the nation is to be governed alternately by the House of Commons and the House of Lords. In truth, parties are very different things from principles. All are agreed that in the present state of things the House of Commons is and must be the chief power in the State, and not the House of Lords. The House of Commons can upset a Ministry, or force it to appeal to the people, the House of Lords cannot. The reason of the difference is, that the first House represents the people, the second does not represent it.

The truth seem to be that the conflict of parties, without being an absolute necessity in our political life, is very useful as things go, to keep alive the public spirit which is a happy characteristic of Englishmen, and that, for the sake of the advantages of such a rousing and invigorating influence among our public men, it is worth while to pay the price which we undoubtedly do pay for the party system. The price which we pay for it is that it may very well be the case, and often has been the case, that the administration of the country is, in many

departments at least, frequently entrusted to feeble hands than might be found for the work. If the twenty-two best cricketers in a public school are divided into two elevens, if the division is at all equal, and the players on one side are not allowed to join the other side, it must stand to reason that only half the best men can be employed in any one eleven to represent the school against outsiders. Five must be taken from one and six from another eleven to make up the best possible representation of the school. When the country determines that the Conservatives are to have a turn of office, it by no means follows that the administration of half-a-dozen departments may not suffer, and, when the Conservatives go out, it may very possibly be the case that half-a-dozen other departments may be losers by the change of men. It is idle to suppose that the civilians who manage the Admiralty, or the Army, or the Exchequer, or the Home Office, or the Board of Trade, or the Post Office, and other such departments, are either better or worse because they belong to one or the other party. Again, it sometimes happens that very eminent men in the legal profession are kept for many years off the Judicial Bench, because they happen to belong to the "outs" instead of to the "ins." A very good general may be out of favour at the Horse Guards, a particular Prime Minister may be under the influence of some wrong-headed adviser as to his ecclesiastical appointments, and the consequence may be that the unhappy Establishment may have a number of party bishops foisted upon it, to the grave discomfort both of clergy and laity.

These are some of the taxes which the country pays for the party system, which it yet adopts as the best on the whole—better at least than the stagnation or disorganization which might follow, if the party system were abandoned. That the tax is not unfelt is shown by the fact that the party system as a rule is not allowed to interfere too peremptorily with the service rendered to the country by governors of our great colonies, or by our ambassadors in foreign courts, who are not necessarily changed with the changes of Ministry, and by our keeping in the great departments of government a set of permanent under-secretaries, who remain unmoved during successive administrations. This is only saying that the common sense and public spirit of both sides overrule, in many material points, the simple instincts of party, whereas, in a country like America, where the whole rank and file of

the *employés* of Government shift on a party victory, the instincts of party overrule considerations of public interest.

Such being the limits under which we allow the working of our political system by means of the great parties, it is surely very unwise to wish that one branch of the Legislature should be retained simply as a stronghold of one party out of the two. That is the same thing as to wish that one party should have a permanent advantage over the other—what amounts in fact to a practical veto, on all legislation which does not emanate from a Ministry of its own colour and a House of Commons in harmony with that Ministry. It is giving an undue preponderance to one party, and a preponderance shown by perpetual rejection of measures already passed by the other Chamber, which represents the people. We can imagine the truest and wisest Conservative in the land acknowledging that it would be the greatest possible misfortune to the House of Lords that it should in this sense become the "Conservative element" in the country. We can imagine the most rabid Radical in the country wishing for nothing better, for the promotion of revolutionary designs, than that the two Houses should represent, not each the balance of parties, but one one party, and the other the other party—provided the House of Commons were the Chamber representing Liberalism, and the House of Lords the Chamber representing Conservatism. The upshot of such a state of things would be, to bring about the evil which the party system is adopted to prevent. It would bring about the conflict between the two Houses, and the consequent revolution which all enemies of the Constitution desire.

On the other hand, it is the truest wisdom to desire that there should be, in the House of Lords at least, if there cannot be in the House of Commons, a large and important body of men accustomed to the practical work of politics and legislation, who are as independent as possible of party ties and discipline. It can hardly be denied that the House of Lords suffers more than the House of Commons from the bad effects of the system of party government. It would seem, indeed, at first sight, that a large body of men, independent and powerful in their own neighbourhoods, holding their seats in the Legislature for life, and, in the great majority of cases, unfettered by any personal considerations of gratitude to the Ministers or the leaders of their party for having placed them there, should be

more likely to think and act for themselves, or rather, out of consideration for the best interests of the country and the Crown, than the members of an assembly like the House of Commons. The Peers have no constituents to be afraid of, if they break the ranks of the party regiment by individual action, and they have, as a rule, nothing to hope for from their leaders—unless it be a red or blue ribbon. Every one knows, however, that while it is always a difficulty for the leaders of party in the House of Commons to carry anything with a high hand by putting something like a strain on the obedience of their followers, there is no assembly in the world the members of which are so docile a flock on great party questions as the House of Lords. It is this which causes the anger of certain impetuous persons to fall, not on the party leaders, but on the House of Lords itself.

Take the last cry. The author or authors of a late attack on that House, published first in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, and afterwards as a separate little volume by Messrs. Macmillan, under the name of *Fifty Years of the House of Lords*, have brought a long and a very ugly-looking string of accusations against the House in question, as to the manner in which it has continually impeded useful legislation, especially in relation to Ireland. The list of measures which the Lords have either rejected or delayed or pulled to pieces, is a very considerable list indeed and in no department of legislature is it a more unfortunate catalogue than in that which has reference to measures intended to place Ireland on an equality with England and Scotland. But we demur to the conclusion that all this obstruction and narrow policy is the fault of the House of Lords as such. It is the result of unscrupulous party use of a majority in that House. On an examination of the political history of the fifty years to which the volume refers, it will be found that a great part of the obstruction complained of took place at times when the Ministry in command of a majority in the House of Commons was in a large minority in the House of Lords, Lord Macaulay has remarked that the Melbourne Government received no mercy from the Opposition in the House of Lords. Bill after Bill was either mutilated or rejected, and this, not only with reference to Ireland. The alliance between the Ministry of that time and O'Connell was no doubt an aggravation to party feeling in England, and the House of Lords was used by men like Lord Lyndhurst—not always in obedience

to their own leaders—as a means of discrediting the Government to which they were bitterly opposed. It is easy for men in such a position to hamper almost indefinitely the action of a Government. Even if the great measures of a Session are not shipwrecked in the Upper House, they can be mutilated and made comparatively inefficient, and a number of vexatious acts of obstructiveness ventured on, which gradually damage the prestige of a Ministry which these politicians are not strong enough directly to overthrow. Without resisting legislation on the greatest subjects of the day, on which the country has declared its mind, it was quite possible for such men to render a session of Parliament unfruitful by a series of party defeats of Government measures, and then, as all who can remember that time will know, to get up at the end of the session thus spoiled, and make a fine speech about the incapacity of the Ministry.

It was in this way that the House of Lords was used for party purposes during the first years which followed the passing of the first Reform Bill. When the strong Government of Sir Robert Peel was formed, there was nothing of this obstructiveness. The Duke of Wellington, the real master of the House of Lords, loyally cast in his lot with Sir Robert Peel, when that great Minister determined on repealing the Corn Laws, and thus the conflict between the two Houses, which might have occurred, was prevented on that occasion. When the Whigs succeeded to power, in consequence of that disruption of the Conservative party which was the great work of the late Lord Beaconsfield, then Mr. Disraeli, the Liberal party was supported for a time, both in the Commons and in the Lords, by a number of the followers of Sir Robert Peel. We doubt whether, as long as the Peelites remained a distinct party in Lords and Commons alike, there was much obstructiveness, so to call it, on the part of the Second Chamber. And this part of the history of the "Fifty Years" shows the great advantage of a middle party, not servilely bound either to Ministry or to Opposition, the natural place for which in our Constitution is the House of Lords, though there have been times when a body of county members in the House of Commons have acted in the same way as a check on the violence of party action. Since the time of which we speak, which about coincides with the deaths of Sir Robert Peel and the Duke of Wellington in 1850 and in 1852, the two parties

have remained face to face, in both Houses, and the immense majority of the Lords follow the Conservative leaders.

What must strike every one who observes our political life, is the very little amount of trouble which the members of the House of Lords take about the discharge of their legislative duties. In truth, this House can hardly be called an assembly of deliberating and debating legislators at all. Not many of the members have had that training to their work which a few years spent in the House of Commons might give them. They no longer vote by proxy, but they deliberate and discuss by proxy. Very few indeed attend the House regularly. The public who read the reports of the Parliamentary proceedings of that august Assembly, day after day, would be surprised to know how very small is the number of hereditary legislators ordinarily present. If there were a rule in the House of Lords, as there is in the House of Commons, that forty members should be present in order to the carrying on of the business of legislation, the House of Lords would not sit more than a dozen times in the session. At least, the enactment of such a rule would make it necessary for the members of the House of Lords to alter their habits entirely. Nor is the public at all aware of the sort of understanding which prevents the continuance of an ordinary debate in the House of Lords beyond the dinner hour. Lord Macaulay, whom we have already mentioned, was certainly one of the greatest speakers of his generation, and he has left it on record that he went down more than once to the House of Lords—in which, we believe, he never actually spoke—with an intention of speaking, and that yet he had no opportunity. A year or two ago, the younger lords tried to get the House at least to sit an hour earlier, in hopes of getting an opportunity for themselves, but they were courteously snubbed by their elders. Over and over again it must have happened to some zealous gentleman who has lately succeeded to a title, to get up a subject, give notice that he will "move for papers," and, in due time, fire off a well-prepared speech to an audience of about a dozen and a half. Then, when he has done, the leader of the House, if he is very courteous, or some one else, if the leader does not choose to pay a compliment, gets up to remark that he "was hardly prepared for so very elaborate a treatment of the subject on the part of his noble friend," and, in a few slipshod sentences, burks the matter altogether, because "at this time of the evening it would be highly inconvenient

that your lordships should be further detained"—from their lordships' dinners.

All these things tend certainly, if not to weaken the position of the House of Lords in the country, at least to weaken in its own members the sense of its usefulness and dignity. It is, to speak plainly, about the dullest and coldest assembly in the world in comparison to its constitutional power. When its majority is in opposition, of course the Ministers of the day have no direct motive for increasing the number of measures that are submitted to it in the first instance. But its activity is not materially increased when the party which is predominant in it is in power. Under the Ministry of Lord Beaconsfield, for example, the House of Lords was the centre of political interest. The Prime Minister was its leader, and the questions which occupied the public mind, as they related to external rather than to internal policy, were just such as to be most fitly discussed in the House of Lords. On its benches sat almost all the most distinguished public men, with the one great exception of Mr. Gladstone, and he was to a certain extent under eclipse. And yet at that time the legislative activity of the Upper House was much what it has always been for a long series of years. It had to occupy itself in doing little during the greater part of the Session, and to hustle through a quantity of work at the end, without any sufficient time for debating what was submitted to it.

The House of Lords has some patent defects in its constitution, which might easily be remedied without any revolution. Such is the manner in which the representative peers for Ireland and Scotland are selected, which gives an unfair advantage to the majority. The House of Lords invented the so-called "three-cornered constituencies," and they did this in the interests of the minorities in those constituencies. It might with advantage introduce the same principle into the method of election of those of its own members who are elected at all. A common-sense arrangement between the two great parties might also be arrived at, by which a larger amount of legislation in the first instance might be allotted to the Upper House. It might also be improved by the reconsideration of the decision made some years ago against the introduction of life peerages. But if noble lords will not attend more than they do to their Parliamentary duties, and if, on the other hand, they continually

present to the country the spectacle of a body powerful for obstruction, which seldom debates, but is always ready to vote as it is told, it would seem as if we might at any time lose its services. We have heard persons, who nevertheless are wise enough to see the immense value of the upper Chamber in the present system of our government, speak as if its fate was settled, and it was only a question of time when it is to fall. We believe that it is far too essential an element in our Constitution to be thus easily abandoned. We do not wish to see it a second House of Commons by any means. One is quite enough. But it may be still what it has been for so many generations, the glory and the safeguard of the country, and Englishmen will never willingly let it die—unless it condemns itself to death. They know that it contains a large number of the wisest and most prudent heads in the Empire; they know that its members can afford to be independent of party, and they attach very great weight to their deliberate judgment. They know that the House of Commons is too impetuous, too easily influenced by the passing madness of the hour in a time of excitement, to be absolutely trusted with the direction of affairs. As long as the great bulk of the House of Lords shows itself free from the ignoble spirit of partisanship, and, still more, superior to class interests and prejudices, they will bear with a great deal of slipshod indolence in its members, certain that in moments of emergency that may trust it to provide *ne quid detrimenti capiat respublica*. As long as class interests and party feeling are kept in due subordination by its members, the House of Lords ought to have little to fear.

2.—REVELATION AND EVOLUTION.

The *Nineteenth Century*, among many interesting articles, has one proposing a strange argument for Revelation. An Anglican clergyman, the Rev. T. W. Fowle, makes an attempt to turn the flank of scepticism by boldly adducing evolution as a proof of a supernatural revelation. Revelation he explains as a fact of the world's history, coming to this orb of ours from without. As a fact of history, it is an element in that course of development which has produced ourselves. Its reality he attempts to prove by a curious and not very convincing argument. We apprehend

truths with alacrity and satisfaction, inasmuch as they are a part of ourselves, forms of our intelligence. Christians apprehend the Christian revelation with this satisfaction, and therefore it must be a truth of history, and one, too, which intimately concerns ourselves, so much so that we may say that, but for the coming of Christ, I should not be what I am. There is an element of truth in Mr. Fowle's position, but one mixed up with so much that is false, with such wild theories, and such an ignorance of the principles of theology, that we fear that his well-meant attempt to support Christianity will prove but a broken reed, fit only to pierce the hand of him who wields it. We cannot imagine any sceptic or waverer being induced by what he says to become a believer, for his misty conceptions and tentative mode of expressing himself indicate one who is himself conscious of being a wanderer "out in the dark." We say that he attempts to support Christianity, but his Christianity is a Christianity of the most nondescript kind, and does not in fact really deserve the name. At the outset of the article he tells us that he approaches the subject "as one to whom evolution is a more certain and necessary truth than revelation," in other words, he makes the certainty of faith something altogether inferior to the certainty of a mere tentative hypothesis respecting the world of nature. After thus discrediting revelation, his next step is to identify all religion with it, and to deny the existence of such a thing as "natural religion." "If a religion of nature were possible," he says (p. 386), "a religion of revelation would be quite unnecessary and impertinent; and it is satisfactory to perceive that, in the grasp of evolution, the idea of a natural religion is dying, like Rousseau's dream of a primitive natural society. Christianity must at least gain something from a philosophy which pronounces, in the matter of religion, 'either revelation or nothing.'" We should like to ask Mr. Fowle whence is derived the knowledge of the difference of right and wrong, of duties to themselves and to each other, of the existence of a God, among those who have never come within the sound of revelation's voice, if it be not from natural religion; how it is that St. Paul tells us that "the invisible things of God are clearly known by those things which are seen, His eternal power also and divinity," if he does not mean that natural religion is a reality, and a most important one. But we beg his pardon; we were forgetting that he does not accept St. Paul as an infallible

teacher of truth, so that even if he is a Christian, he is not in any sense a Bible Christian, for he says that outward things are the veil through which we strain our eyes, "not indeed as St. Paul, *with excusable ardour*, affirmed to see clearly, but to catch some far-off vision of the eternal power and godhead" (p. 401). But, as a matter of fact, Mr. Fowle can scarcely be called a Christian at all, using the word in the proper sense as believing with all his heart that Jesus of Nazareth was the consubstantial Son of the Eternal Father, the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, as the careful reader of his article will see clearly enough from hints and remarks scattered up and down in it.

There is something very sad to see the fragments of truth which still linger among Anglicans handled by such defenders as Mr. Fowle. If these are their champions of orthodoxy, no wonder that the sceptic is ravaging their hearths and homes. The writers of the *Nineteenth Century* are representative men, and we suppose that our writer is a representative of the intellect and culture of the country parsons. He is, if we remember right, an Oxford man, who took high honours. He comes forward, lance in hand, to meet the advancing foe of unbelief, and the very weapon in his hand is one which—powerless against the enemy—is fatal to the cause of him who carries it. What could be a more frightful confession of weakness than for one who calls himself a Christian to tell his opponents, as Mr. Fowle does almost in so many words—"You know I am an advocate of Christianity, but if it were a question between evolution and Christianity, I should at once throw Christianity to the dogs. I do not in the least believe in natural religion. I think Pantheism very good and very true so far as it goes (p. 401). If a man does not believe in revelation, I don't blame him, or say that he will suffer for it hereafter (p. 403), but yet, as a country parson, I feel a pleasure in accepting such facts of the Christian hypothesis as recommend themselves to my intelligence; I apprehend them with alacrity, and so I am certain that it is true." If our reader thinks that we are misrepresenting poor Mr. Fowle, let him peruse the article himself.

REVIEWS.

1. *The Catechumen: an aid to the intelligent knowledge of the Catechism.* By J. G. Wenham, Canon of Southwark, and Diocesan Inspector of Schools. Burns and Oates.

CATHOLIC education in England already owes much to Canon Wenham for the many years that he has been working manfully in its behalf. He has brought his early culture and his subsequent theological training to bear on the most important of all the needs of the Catholic Church in England, the religious instruction of our children, and especially of our poor children. A well-trained and well-instructed child will generally turn out a loyal, staunch Catholic. Even if for a time it should forget the lessons of its innocent childhood, it will return, almost infallibly, as years go on, to the duties of its holy religion. The valuable little book before us will do much to confirm and render permanent the good work which Canon Wenham has been doing by his personal labours as Diocesan Inspector. The want of such a book has long been felt among us, and we have had to resort to the translation of foreign Manuals, which, however excellent in themselves, have never the same attractiveness to Englishmen as a genuine English book, written for English-speaking Catholics by a highly-educated Englishman. *The Catechumen* is essentially English in the best sense, inasmuch as it is practical and simple, written in short, clear sentences, easy for a child to understand, and directed not merely to impart a theoretical knowledge of the Catechism, but to furnish practical aids and hints to those who have not access to elaborate treatises on moral theology, and who desire to know what is and what is not forbidden by the law of God. We notice, too, another element of great value, which shows how well Canon Wenham understands the needs of those for whom he is writing. Almost every important piece of theology is enforced by a simple illustration or parallel from ordinary life. Thus, speaking of the difference between mortal and venial sin, he says: "There is the same difference about those things that do harm to the body. Slight diseases and wounds injure the body: but a grievous wound or disease will kill it. Yet sometimes there seems very little difference between a wound that is slight and one that is deadly, and sometimes

those that cause very little pain and do not show much are the most fatal. Yet what an immense difference there is between a mortal wound and one that is not mortal. So there is this difference between a mortal sin and a venial sin: that mortal sin destroys all—the supernatural life of the soul—and venial sin does not. And it is better, therefore, to be guilty of a hundred venial sins, and to continue still to be the children of God in His grace and love, than one mortal sin, which would make us lose His love and forfeit the privilege of being His children.”¹

But the practical character of the book is still more admirable. We commend to our readers for instance to read carefully the excellent instruction given on Rash Judgment and Detraction² if they wish for a brief summary of doctrine, which, if observed, will save them from many a sin and imperfection. The difficult subject of Lying is excellently treated, and in general the book bears the marks of long experience as well as of careful study and great natural ability. Among a vast number of theological statements it is almost impossible to avoid some which other theologians would criticize as either too lax or too severe, but few indeed are those to which the most fault-finding critic could take serious exception. We hope to see *The Catechumen* in the hands of all school teachers. They will find it an unlimited source of instructions and exhortations to the children under their care. We can go further than this, and strongly advise every parish priest to buy the book and make it the staple of his religious instructions. Of all the manuals of religious doctrine which have come into our hands it is far the best, and if it does not obtain a wide circulation, it will show a strange want of appreciation of its merits in the Catholic body. It is, we are glad to say, very cheap, it is very nicely got up, and would be a suitable and useful prize for children. If they study it and observe its precepts, they will be well-instructed in their theology and faithful servants of God.

We are glad to see that it is dedicated to a religious body, whom to know is to respect and admire. Canon Wenham, in his dedication, says that he dedicates it to the Sisters of Notre Dame, in humble recognition of the great services rendered by them in the work of Christian education. Such a testimony from the pen of one who has had such excellent opportunities of judging is as valuable as it is well deserved. We feel sure

¹ Pp. 155, 156. ² Pp. 268—270.

that the good Sisters when they read the book will be able to return the compliment, and will find the publication of *The Catechumen* another of such services on its author's part and a substantial help to them in their pious and devoted labours.

2. *The Land of Gilead.* With Excursions in the Lebanon. By Laurence Oliphant. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons.

The special object of the writer's visit to Palestine was to find some district in which he might hope to persuade the Turkish Government to found a colony, with the view of introducing reforms into its own internal administration. Although he failed to attain this ultimate aim, Mr. Oliphant has succeeded in drawing fresh attention to the capabilities of the soil and the grandeur of the scenery in the hitherto but slightly explored regions of the Lebanon and the country stretching along the eastern side of the Jordan. Besides this, his book is most interesting and valuable to the student of Old Testament history, for he discusses once more with great care the question of the sites of the famous cities of old, and of the boundaries which separated one Jewish tribe or one Pagan race from another. He describes the present state of the ruins which mark out the onward journey for the traveller, at the same time that the uncertainty in which the origin of many of these is still left, proves how hopeless are the chances of ever finding out exactly the situation of places familiar to us in the Bible.

The conclusion of his journeyings to and fro is that he would fain have planted his colony within the land of Gilead, in the district named Belka, so as to be bordered on the north by the Jabbok, a tributary of the River Jordan, on the west partly by the Jordan itself and partly by the north-west shores of the Dead Sea, thus including its width, on the south by the River Arnon flowing into it, and on the east by an imaginary line drawn along the limits of the productive plains. In making such selection the writer was guided by the great advantages which this area would afford, but the experiment which he proposed is only one out of many plans easily suggested but not destined to be carried out. His readers are nevertheless clear gainers by the fruits of Mr. Oliphant's enterprising labours, an epithet which they thoroughly deserve, for he and his companion, putting only a few pounds into their pockets, taking no

tents, and without dragoman, with only two mules and muleteers at the most to carry baggage, bedding, cooking utensils, and a few necessary articles of food, threw themselves from the very first upon the hospitality of the natives, and resolved to trust to the chapter of accidents. From Sidon they took a south-easterly direction inland, passing through the most lovely country, till they reached the half marsh, half lake of "Ard el Huleh," on the line of the Jordan, and due north of the Sea of Tiberias. Drainage and cultivation might make this spot as salubrious and as fertile as any in Palestine. They crossed the Jordan, and still slanting eastward, encountered at Kéineitireh a colony of three thousand Circassians, emigrants from Widdin in Bulgaria, who were already establishing themselves in comparative peace and comfort. Jaulan is a tract of country skirting the east bank of the Jordan and the shores of the Lake of Tiberias, and immediately leading into the land of Gilead. It is flanked by mountains on both sides, and abounds in pastures, so that the Arabs own extensive flocks of camels, cattle, and sheep, while the Kurds bring to it large droves of horses. The view from Tel el Faris, the crater of an extinct volcano, comprises the whole territory once ruled over by Og, the King of Bashan, now a vast expanse of well-watered plain, strewn here and there with basaltic rocks. The south is closed in with winding mountain gorges, beyond which the country again becomes wooded and undulating, till it terminates in the lofty range marking the land of Gilead. Towards the east, both north and south, are stretched plains rich in pasture or admirably adapted for agriculture; it is only in the direction of the south that wild and barren mountains are grouped closely together.

The River Yarmûk, with its cataracts and steep rocky sides, divides Jaulan from Gilead, and in A.D. 636 witnessed that sanguinary battle fought by the Arabs against the Byzantines, which drove out Christian civilization and established the Moslem supremacy. The country now becomes alive with ruins and reminiscences of the times of the Crusaders, while each fresh step carries back the mind of the traveller to the still earlier days of Scripture history. A large number of the inhabitants of Hauran and of the territory of Ajlun still live in caves and grottoes, those homes scooped out by nature in the rock, where doubtless dwelt the giants recorded in the third chapter of Deuteronomy. Sweeping round towards the Jordan

again, our traveller ascended a little to visit the ancient Gadara, then took the route south once more, penetrating further into the land of Gilead, and approaching the Dead Sea by way of the plains that seemed to him the fairest and most fertile for the project he had in his thoughts. The more he wandered amongst the hills which environed them, the more charmed he was with their scenery and with "the health-giving qualities of their sharp bracing air." Here were forests celebrated for their products of spices, balm, and myrrh. The balm of Gilead was as highly prized as it was rare; might it not be profitably cultivated now? The popular impression of Palestine is gathered from tourists who confine themselves to the country lying between Jordan and the sea, whereas the real richness and luxuriance of the land remains all neglected and despised across the river. It extends as far as the plains of Moab, which were once allotted to the favoured tribe of Reuben, and comprise vast alluvial deposits, studded with the knolls and ridges on which the old cities stood, abundantly supplied with reservoirs and cisterns of water. It was this valley of the Jordan that Lot selected when he parted from Abraham, for it was "watered throughout, as the paradise of the Lord." Even the Dead Sea conceals its wealth of chemical and mineral deposits.

Mr. Oliphant pauses frequently in his description of scenery, of ruins, and of the natural qualities of the soil, to dwell upon the character and habits of the various families and tribes, and upon their history and the relationship or antagonism in which they stand to one another. At other times he narrates, with a calm and self-possessed enjoyment, the few little difficulties or adventures which came across his path.

-
3. *Order out of Chaos.* Three Sermons preached at All Saints, Lambeth, by F. G. Lee, D.D. Allen and Co.

Anglicanism is the religion of anomalies, but the delivery and publication of these three sermons by an Anglican clergyman is an anomaly scarcely credible. From beginning to end they are an outspoken, undisguised attack on the Establishment of which Dr. Lee is a minister. He is a man of extensive research, considerable power, and wide information, and he has been unable to resist the force of truth, or to avoid recognizing the true character of the Reformation, or the unhappy condition of the religious body to which he belongs. He traces the

miseries of Anglicanism to their true source—separation from the See of Peter—and is not afraid to tell his co-religionists the truth, and that in words which it is hard to believe are uttered by one who still professes an adherence to the Thirty-Nine Articles. What Catholic could have used plainer language than the following?

In the Church of God, a universal spiritual body, all, of course, belongs to Peter's Successor, which was originally given to St. Peter by our Lord. Whatever the Divine donation was originally, man did not bestow it and man cannot take it away. Moreover, the government of the Catholic Church by Bishops, Primates, Metropolitans, and Patriarchs, with one Visible Head, is so exactly of that practical nature, that no wholly independent and isolated religious body can possibly participate either in its government or in the blessing of being rightly governed, so long as it remains independent. When any Christians are isolated, the dangers and evils of isolation must of sheer necessity constantly appear. When these dangers are duly apprehended, continued corporate isolation, with no endeavours to promote peace, becomes a distinct sin against unity (p. 57).

And Dr. Lee does "duly apprehend" them. Weakness and confusion, he says, "are a portion of the Reformation heritage." "The nation is infected with the deadly views of heresy and schism." "In the Universities the Christian faith is being completely suppressed: while the Christian law of marriage is being deliberately weakened." One exalted prelate may openly deny the truths of the Athanasian Creed and there is none to rebuke him; another "may openly and directly maintain that there is no Christian priesthood, and that such an idea comes distinctly from the devil himself." "The most shocking fact of all, and a direct result of our miserable divisions, is that both in city and country very large and important masses of the people are even now simply reverting to Paganism."

What, then, is Dr. Lee's own position? How does he clear himself from the sin of schism? He distinctly acknowledges the Pope as Archbishop Tait's "direct spiritual superior, both in rank and in authority," and, therefore, necessarily as his own. What is his answer, then, to His Holiness when he tells him that he (Dr. Lee) is bound at the peril of his salvation, to submit to the See of Peter? As far as we can understand his position, he would answer and does answer as follows: "I am quite aware that the so-called Reformation was a hideous crime wrought with deadly consequences. I know full well

that the Church of England is bound to come and lay its submission at the feet of your Holiness. I am doing my best to induce it to do so. Corporate Reunion is and ever has been the dream of my life. I still hope against hope that the grace of God may work this miracle—that once more we may be united to our true spiritual Mother—the Church which recognizes Peter's Successor as its Head. But I see no necessity for—in fact, I have the greatest objection to—individual secession. I, as a baptized person, belong to the Catholic Church of which you are the Head, and until I am personally and canonically cut off from it by a formal and regular process, I claim my right to my inheritance. I am a Catholic by baptism, and you cannot un-Catholicize me. It is true that I am called an Anglican, but I do not believe in 'Anglicanism.' It is true the Thirty-Nine Articles denounce the Church of Rome and many of her doctrines, but I regard these Articles 'not as dogmas to be believed, but as opinions—not a little out of date—which the local Church of England recommends to me, but which I am perfectly free to accept or reject as I please.' Prove me not to be a Catholic and at once I throw myself at your Holiness' feet, and humbly submit to all that you ask. But till this is proved, I must respectfully decline to secede, since 'individual secession intensifies divisions and stirs up ill-feeling.'"

We hope we have fairly represented Dr. Lee's ingenious and eccentric position. Now what answer are we to make to him? First of all we would remind him that of all the two hundred millions of Christians who submit to the See of Rome, there is not one but would tell him that he has no sort of claim to be a Catholic, properly speaking, merely by reason of his baptism. The Church of Christ—that Church of which it is true *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*—contains only those who being made members of it by baptism, still remain faithful to each and all of her dogmas. The moment that a child having attained the age of reason implicitly or explicitly denies any article of faith, or acknowledges the authority of any religious body which does not submit to the Holy See, he thereby (culpably or inculpably) cuts himself off from the Visible Church of Christ, and till he comes forward and make his act of submission, he remains an alien and a schismatic—and this is Dr. Lee's position. Where would the sin of schism be, if I could acknowledge a local superior antagonistic to Rome as well as Rome

itself? And we may add where would the sin of heresy be, if we belong to a body whose articles of belief are the Thirty-Nine Articles, which declare that the Church of Rome has erred in matters of faith, that Transubstantiation destroys the nature of a sacrament, that Confirmation and Penance are not Sacraments of the Gospel—and if, belonging to such a body, at the same time we can be faithful members of the Church? Does Dr. Lee, knowing that there is not a bishop, priest, or layman in the Catholic Church who would not utterly condemn his position, venture to say that they are all wrong and he alone is right? that all the theologians of the Church are quite mistaken when they tell him he is neither more nor less than a heretic and an alien to the Church of Christ? If he acknowledges the Pope as his Superior, let him go and state his case to him, and accept his decision. To acknowledge any one as your superior in matters of faith and doctrine, as having a right to command you and to impose a strict obligation of obedience, and at the same time to know that that same superior does not and cannot recognize you as his subject, is an anomaly—or rather a contradiction in terms. The Pope tells Dr. Lee that he, as a minister of Anglicanism, is *ipso facto* a rebel. "No," says Dr. Lee, "I am no rebel. I am the loyal subject of your Holiness." "Well, then," answers the Pope, "will you submit to my authority?" "Certainly," answers Dr. Lee. "Will you do what I tell you?" Oh, yes," answers Dr. Lee; "only please remember that I draw the line at 'individual secession'—'it intensifies divisions and stirs up ill-feeling.'" "Quite true, Dr. Lee," we could fancy His Holiness answering. "Once upon a time in the world's history there appeared on earth one Who, Prince of Peace though He was, says of Himself that He came to send not peace but a sword—to set mother against daughter, and daughter against mother—to make a man's foes those of his own household. What else was this but to stir up ill-feeling and intensify divisions? Yes, Dr. Lee, if you claim Christ as your Master you must learn of Him—you must learn that lesson to which you have been long working your way, the lesson of humble submission. You must come as a little child to the feet of Christ's representative, and obey at any cost your Superior's commands. Your house is built upon the sand, and you will not quit it because, forsooth, you fear to 'stir up ill-feeling and intensify divisions.' And when your poor tenement is swallowed up by the waves and

you with it, what will it avail you to say that you were perfectly well aware of its character, and were most anxious to transfer it bodily on to the rock, if it had not been for the blind perversity and folly and unbelief of your fellow-lodgers. God has given you the grace of seeing your danger—may He give you the grace before it is too late of making your way into the House upon the Rock."

Such, we imagine, would be His Holiness' reply; and we venture to hope that when Dr. Lee wakes up from his dream of Corporate Reunion, he may find that the mists around him are dispelled by the bright morning star, bringing for him *Order out of Chaos*, resting over the house where Peter's Successor dwells, and telling him that there alone will he find the Saviour of the world, even though his journey thither may be at the cost of stirring up Protestant ill-feeling and intensifying sectarian divisions.

4. *Edgar Allan Poe. His Life, Letters, and Opinions.* By John H. Ingram. London: John Hogg.

We have been too much in the habit of associating the name of Edgar Poe with the idea of a poet and prose writer of great power, but at the same time of a man whose over-sensitiveness and excitability of temperament, all the more inflamed by a headstrong will and by the perpetual use of stimulants, had disordered both mind and heart, and had alienated from him all his friends. This view of the poet's character is a very general one, and owes its origin to the apparently unfair and false picture drawn of him in a Life attached to the earliest edition of his works, by Mr. Rufus Griswold. It takes a very long time to remove the impressions produced by the first memoirs published of any celebrated man, and few persons seem alive to the serious responsibility they take upon themselves when, in ill-considered and often strongly prejudiced haste, they pronounce upon the whole moral principle and conduct of one to whom they do not give themselves time to do justice. Thus, in the present instance, Mrs. Clemm, Edgar Poe's mother-in-law, who had far more opportunity than almost any one else of forming a true, complete, and unbiassed judgment of his merits and demerits, was much pleased to find herself waited upon, within a few days of his death, by several gentlemen anxious to bring out at once an edition of his works.

But when, ere the first year had passed, she read the short life above alluded to, her gratitude was promptly changed into the greatest distress and indignation at what she felt to be gross misstatements and calumnies.

Mr. Ingram's Preface to his Life of Edgar Poe proves that he must have at least expended much thought and research upon his study of the character and mental condition of this much abused and very unhappy man. Besides his present book, he published in 1874 an edition of Poe's writings, prefixing to it a short vindictory memoir, and in addition to that he has both before and since written essays on Poe's life and works. His verdict is therefore deserving of all weight and consideration, while he has put in so strong a plea for a more mitigated sentence as to make his defence of Edgar Poe on many points a work of justice as well as charity to the memory of the dead. Whatever may have been this man's faults, we cannot bring ourselves to judge them too unkindly when we come to know under what serious misfortunes he laboured in his own mental organization, in the defects of his training and education, and in the painful and harassing circumstances of his life throughout. He had nothing to be ashamed of in the position in life of his family or of his parents. His grandfather, General David Poe, was born in Ireland, but had been taken when very young to the United States. His father, also named David, was placed under a barrister to study for the law, but having been smitten with a passion for the stage, and shortly after with the charms of a young actress, respectably born and talented in her profession, and also as a painter, he left home to be married when only nineteen, and was obliged to seek a livelihood as an actor. Consumption soon declared itself in both husband and wife, and within five years of their marriage their three children, William, Edgar, and Rosalie, were left orphans. Edgar, born at Boston on the 19th of January, 1809, was adopted by his godfather, Mr. John Allan, a native of Ayrshire in Scotland, who had made a considerable fortune by trade in America.

It will at once be seen that the future poet inherited from his parents a very delicate constitution of body, and a strongly imaginative and easily excitable temperament of mind, both requiring an especially careful and judicious bringing up. Unfortunately for a child of morbidly nervous organization, very handsome in figure and features, and of engaging manners, precocious too in mind and quick in learning, his adoptive

parents encouraged the display of powers of which they felt proud, and by keeping him in a state of constantly recurring excitement, fostered those very tendencies which they ought to have held in check. After his education had been begun at Richmond they took the child with them to Europe, and when they settled down for a time in London, Edgar Allan, as he was then called, was placed at a school in Stoke Newington, in his day a dull and isolated village. Here he worked hard, but got into a good deal of mischief, having an unstinted allowance of pocket money, and being uncontrolled master of himself and his actions as long as he was at home. When recalled to America at the age of twelve he returned to habits of moody idleness, and his mind, thus left to itself, became more confirmed in its own inherent defects. His character during the four years that he subsequently spent at an academy in Richmond was that of a proud and reserved lad, obtaining the admiration rather than the affection of his companions; yet he was extraordinarily faithful in his friendship, intensely sensitive alike to kindness and unkindness, and passionate in his attachments. Even already he had impressed others with a sense of his intellectual superiority, besides being a good Latin and a fine French scholar. In physical courage and athletic sports he was *facile princeps* over all, and in his physical as well as his mental proclivities he was surprisingly like, as he was an enthusiastic imitator of, Byron. There was also in his heart, though with far more excuse, that poet's fierce and contemptuous bitterness of feeling towards others, for he was conscious that, compared with those around him, his parentage was obscure, and his position in society dependent on the capricious patronage of a benefactor, who had neither the sympathy nor discretion of a father's love to bestow on him.

During the year which he spent at the University of Virginia, he was tolerably regular in his attendance at lectures and attention to the rules, and was a successful student, acknowledged by all to possess real genius and diversity of talent, besides many noble qualities. His behaviour was always that of a gentleman, having among the professors themselves the reputation of being a sober, quiet, orderly young man. At this early period sorrowful thoughts were perpetually invading his mind, and he allowed himself to take refuge from them in the excitement and absorption of gambling, although at this time he was never observed to be in the slightest degree under the influence of intoxicating

liquors. His first literary venture appeared publicly in his native city of Boston, one year afterwards, but we cannot enter on the history of his literary career, except in so far as this is illustrative of his personal character, because the ability of his wild fanciful stories, and the force and elegance of his melodious poetry are beyond all question. His almost unwholesome study of himself, and yet his just appreciation in great measure of his own characteristic failings, are very noticeable in all his earliest compositions. Knowing his after fortunes, it is painful to us to read the self-confident plans and future predictions of his youth. These were but the first in a long series of promises to himself and his friends of established success and fame, promises which the future was never to see realized. One literary undertaking after another was commenced under the direction of some editor, but after the ability of his pen had largely increased the popularity of each periodical in turn, it was suddenly abandoned for some visionary star in the literary world which he was to conduct entirely himself. In this line of literature, too, he made many bitter enemies, and by no means improved his own disposition or nervous temperament by the biting sarcasm of his trenchant criticisms. It is upon his stories and his poetry that his reputation will be found most solidly built.

In private life misfortunes and disappointments seemed to dog his footsteps. The death, in 1829, of Mrs. Allan, his adopted mother, at the end of his two years' mysterious absence in Europe, entirely changed the future prospects of his life, and as Mr. Allan shortly afterwards married again and had a son, Poe found himself anything but welcomed at his house. On the occasion of a sudden quarrel with the second Mrs. Allan, he was excluded altogether, and had to go forth homeless and penniless into the world. After vain endeavours to delay the poet's marriage to Mrs. Clemm's daughter Virginia, on account of the extreme youth of the intended bride, it took place on the 6th of May, 1836. Very few weeks had elapsed before he was involved in pecuniary embarrassments, not for the first time, and this unhappy state of things became chronic with him. But in the year 1842, two sad calamities befell him, which were to hover over and darken, at more or less intervals, his whole future life. At that time his young wife broke a blood-vessel, and the dread of her death at any moment, constantly re-awakened by her perilous relapses, must have preyed terribly on the mind of her passionately devoted husband. To this

strain upon his nerves he attributed the habit of drinking which he now formed, and never wholly abandoned, though it still further destroyed health and happiness, and placed his reputation at the mercy of implacable foes, against whom his true friends, many in number, most zealously defended him. Truly touching are the descriptions of the delicacy and constancy of his love for his beautiful fragile wife, whom every one esteemed and admired, and who returned his love with an intensity equal to his own. This mutual love was undoubtedly the spring of that ardent and unwavering affection which bound Virginia's mother to her afflicted son-in-law, and gave such force to her testimony long afterwards that Poe had been devoted to his wife till the very hour of her death, an event which took place on the 30th of January, 1847. About a year after this Edgar Poe succeeded in persuading the authoress, Mrs. Whiteman, to consent to marry him, on the condition that he entirely forswore the use of stimulants, but when it was reported to her that he had violated those terms, the marriage was broken off by her at once. His enemies made great capital out of this episode, as well as out of the poet's enthusiastic affection for Mrs. Osgood, for a lady whom he addressed as "Annie," and for Mrs. Shew. But all such attachments were akin to the tenderness of his feelings towards his wife's mother, and it is evident to every one who seeks to deal fairly with his life and character that he had become morbidly dependent on the encouragement and advice of sympathetic and unselfish friends, to whom he might fly for consolation, and unveil the darkest mysteries of his troubled mind. These ladies were esteemed by all who knew them, they possessed each other's entire intimacy and confidence, and maintained to the last the fullest sympathy with Mrs. Clemm in her grief for the sufferings and death of her daughter and in her anxieties about her son-in-law. As though in keeping with the melancholy history of his whole life, the last moments of Edgar Poe are wrapt in gloom. There is too much reason to fear that illness and distress of mind drove him to take some stimulant or deleterious drug, that he fell into the hands of a set of ruffians on a polling day in the streets of Baltimore, and was further drugged to serve their purposes. When found lying in a state of insensibility on a bench beside the wharf, he was conveyed to a hospital, and, though he recovered momentary consciousness, the shock overwhelmed his enfeebled mind and body, and on

the 7th of October, 1849, this poor tortured and misguided spirit passed away.

It will surely be allowed that amongst much which tells sadly of the shipwreck of mental powers, and of the misdirection of great gifts, there was more than enough of misfortune, of exaggeration of faults, and of actual calumny, to overthrow so ill-balanced a mind. Nor can we conclude without adding that there must have been much also to commend, and even admire, in one of whom, amongst many other witnesses, a Mr. Gowans, known as "one of the most truthful and uncompromising of men," testifies from daily personal observation that "the characters drawn of Poe by his various biographers and critics may with safety be pronounced an excess of exaggeration, but this is not to be much wondered at, when it is taken into consideration that these men were rivals either as poets or prose writers. He was one of the most courteous, gentlemanly, and intelligent companions I have ever met with." A rival author, and yet a true friend, says of him: "He had the docility and kind-heartedness of a child. No man was more quickly touched by a kindness, none more prompt to atone for an injury. Knowing all his hopes and fears and little annoyances of life, as well as his high-hearted struggle with adverse fate, yet he was always the same polished gentleman, the quiet, unobtrusive, thoughtful scholar, the devoted husband, frugal in his personal expenses, punctual and unwearied in his industry, and the soul of honour in all his transactions." Captain Mayne Reid embodies the summing up of Mr. Ingram's two volumes of biography when he states: "In the list of literary men there has been no such spiteful biographer as Rufus Griswold, and never such a victim of posthumous spite as poor Edgar Allan Poe."

5. *Of the Imitation of Christ.* Kegan Paul and Co.

This beautiful little edition of the *Imitation of Christ* has the merit of being as literal as it can be, consistently with good English and the idiomatic expressions of our language. Based on the well known edition of Challoner, it has had the advantage of a double revision. One of the first classical scholars of our day has taken charge of the translation as such, while an able theologian of the Oratory at Birmingham has, we believe, made himself responsible for the correctness of theo-

logical expression. We have every reason to be grateful to Mr. Kegan Paul for this "revised translation." It is not every Protestant publisher who would have the courage to produce the original with such faithful exactness, and to intrust it to the hands of Catholic editors. We recommend it to every one who wishes to possess in a convenient form, which he can easily slip into any side-pocket, a book which is as the daily manna of the soul to tens of thousands of pious Catholics, and is loved and valued by all who know it.

NOTICES.

The Pursuit of Diarmuid and Grainne. Part II. Dublin: M. H. Gill and Son.—Such is the English title of a work which we must be excused from announcing in its Celtic characters. It is published for the "Society for the Preservation of the Irish Language," a thoroughly laudable object. This small volume is full of information on a variety of subjects, for besides a learned Introduction on Finian prose tales and poems in general, it gives the second part of the Story above indicated, first in the original text, and then in a translation. To these follow Notes and a Glossary, while an Appendix contains the Report of the Society for 1880. The poetry is quite Ossianic, not only in style but in origin, for Oisín is traditionally regarded as its author.

